

THE
PANOPLIST,
AND
MISSIONARY MAGAZINE.

No. 4.

APRIL, 1816.

VOL. XII.

MISCELLANEOUS.

For the Panoplist.

ON THE PREACHING OF WHITEFIELD.

As a preacher of the Gospel, Whitefield was a luminary in the Church. The extended sphere of his labors; the number and frequency of his sermons; the largeness of his congregations; the interest excited in all classes of people; the deep impressions made on them; and the great change in the style of preaching, which he was the instrument of effecting; are circumstances, that stamp his preaching with an importance, which has no parallel in the history of the pulpit. No man, since the days of the Apostles, ever preached so often, during such a length of time, in so many different places, to such crowded auditories, and with such apparent success. People followed him from town to town, from state to state, and in some instances from country to country. His auditories often consisted of four or five thousand; in populous towns they swelled to ten, sometimes to fourteen, and, on different occasions, twenty, twenty-five, or thirty thousand. What was it that influenced such multitudes to attend on his preaching? Was it curiosity merely, or a love of novelty? Doubtless both these principles had an influence; but one fact shews that these were not the chief motives:—for nearly all who heard him once, were disposed to hear him a second time, and a third, and at every succeeding opportunity. He did not amuse his hearers with trifling speculations; he forced their attention to important truths. When he began to speak, they listened; as he proceeded they hung upon his lips; and the increasing torrent of his eloquence bore them down with an irresistible force. Thousands, who are now sleeping in Jesus, received their first religious impressions from his sermons; and many, yet alive, hold in grateful remembrance his preaching, as the means of first awaking them to a concern for religion.

But the influence of his preaching was not limited to the sphere of his personal labors. The state of religion in the English Church was low, at the time when he entered on his ministry. The pulpit had become a political engine, and a secular and political theology had taken the place of serious and practical Christianity. The principles of natural religion; the moral fitness of things; the evidences of revelation; and the morality of the Gospel, were much

VOL. XII.

insisted on from the pulpit, while the vital doctrines of Christianity were becoming unfashionable. These doctrines, on which "as cardinal points, the respected Fathers of the reformation had made all true holiness of life to hinge," were well nigh excluded from the English pulpit. The consequence was, that vital piety declined. Socinianism and other heresies sprung up, and infidelity gained ground. Such was the religious state of the English Church, when Whitefield arose. He condemned the lax and unscriptural notions of the age; brought to view the vital doctrines of the Gospel; exposed the deformity of the human heart; carried home his discourses to the consciences of men; and, with a persevering energy, stemmed the torrent of irreligion, which threatened to sweep from the Church every vestige of its primitive purity. The Spirit of God attended him; religion revived; and a great change in the exercises of the English pulpit was gradually effected. By means of Whitefield, too, the mode of preaching in Scotland and New England became more evangelical. Considering his preaching in its influence on the clergy and the style of the pulpit, its happy effects remain in the Church to the present day.

Now, after laying out of our estimate all those effects of his preaching, which are to be attributed to a special divine influence, or to the influence of curiosity or novelty, there still remain to be accounted for effects the most surprising. There was a certain something in Whitefield, which gave him an astonishing ascendancy over the human mind. As by a kind of magic, thousands were hushed to silence, when he began to speak, and the most obdurate hearts melted into tenderness under the warmth of his discourses. His charity sermons strikingly illustrate this remark: these often extorted generous sums from worldly-minded penurious men, who, when they had recovered their former feelings, were ready to believe, that their money "had been conjured from them by some inexplicable charm." The power of his eloquence constituted the charm. I am next to inquire in what that power consisted.

The printed sermons of Whitefield give us but an imperfect idea of his preaching. In them we perceive some excellences, interspersed with many defects. Their merit as sermons, I shall not now examine. It is manifest, however, that his success depended more on the simplicity of their style, than their weight of matter, and that the power of his eloquence is to be sought rather in the manner of his delivery, than in the structure of his sermons.

He possessed all the natural endowments, requisite to an animated and powerful delivery. His organs of speech were good, his articulation clear and distinct, his voice strong and musical, and his pronunciation manly and graceful. Beside these qualifications, he possessed a natural sensibility, which rendered him susceptible of the tenderest emotions, and a lively imagination, which gave him surprising powers of description. In the cultivation of these endowments, he took nature for his model. Every thing in his language, in his appearance, his look, his action, his posture, and in his whole manner, was natural. The simplicity of Whitefield's

manner was a charm to his hearers. His descriptions were so clear, natural and lively, that they answered the end of real exhibitions. The objects described were before his hearers; and to render the enchantment still stronger, his action corresponded to the simplicity and sprightliness of his descriptions; so that while his voice spoke to the ear, his look, his gesture, his whole appearance spoke to the eye. His manner discovered no labor, no art, no affectation of display. Indeed, he was the child of nature, he studied her language: hence an expressive look, an emphatic pause, or a passionate cry, not unfrequently produced a deeper impression, than all the rounded periods in the world could have done.

Besides good natural endowments and simplicity of manner, Whitefield possessed a thorough knowledge of the human heart, and of the springs of human action. This knowledge enabled him to portray the workings of the human soul, and to expose its moral deformity. By means of it, he shaped his preaching to the characters and circumstances of his hearers. Hence, they felt that they were personally addressed, and his sermons weighed them down with a mighty force.

But, what constituted the life and soul of his eloquence was his ardent piety. Without this, all his powers of oratory never could have produced half the effects which he did produce. He always felt his subject; its importance engrossed his whole soul. He entered the pulpit with a significance of countenance, and a gravity of deportment, that bespoke a soul, tremblingly alive to the awful responsibility of the station. Every faculty of body and mind seemed wrought up to the highest pitch. His very appearance indicated the importance of his business, and impressed his hearers with awe. He spoke as one standing in the immediate presence of God. In his manner were combined solemnity and affection, earnestness and pathos. His tears and sobs, which often interrupted him, denoted a tender solicitude for his hearers. Hence, his discourses, coming from a heart warm with love, possessed a glow of feeling, which, like the electric fluid, shot from heart to heart, till it reached all within the sphere of his voice. The love of God shed abroad in his own soul, transported him with an holy ardor, and prompted him to an earnestness and importunity of manner, which aroused the most stupid and compelled them to feel.

The inquiry now arises, what would be the effects of Whitefield's preaching at the present day? In answer to this inquiry, it may be replied, that he, who could charm by his eloquence such men as Chesterfield, Bolingbroke, and Hume, would doubtless interest men of literature, or of pleasure, in this or any other age. Probably our most refined congregations would hang in breathless silence on his lips. The principles, which entered into his preaching, will ever form the basis of animated and earnest delivery. Good natural endowments, simplicity of manner, thorough knowledge of human nature, and a transformation of the preacher's soul into his subject, will, in all cases, render him eloquent. If he does not command, he will invite attention; if he does not overwhelm, he will at

least interest; if he does not actually gain admission to the hearts of his hearers, he will have possession of all the avenues by which an admission can be gained.

To conclude: Is Whitefield a proper model for imitation? Certainly not. His manner was his own: his familiar addresses, powers of action, and talents of fixing the attention, were excellences; but they were excellences which have never been copied with success. "Other ministers," says Newton, "could preach the Gospel as clearly, and in general say the same things; but no man living could say them in the same way."—It would be folly, therefore, in any preacher to attempt to copy Whitefield's manner; yet, in many respects he ought to be imitated by every preacher. He was wholly devoted to the work of the ministry; he faithfully preached the truths of the Bible; he was zealous, constant and unwearied in his labors; he was eminently a man of prayer; he always chose to go from his closet to the pulpit; his great object was to exalt Christ crucified and to win souls to him. In view of multiplied invitations to visit different places, he says, "I want more tongues, more bodies, more souls for the Lord Jesus; had I ten thousand he should have them all!" Let such a spirit pervade the clergy of our country, and the form of our sacred eloquence would be no longer subject to the reproach, "that the pulse at her heart beats languidly, and her pale lip attests, that no seraph has touched it with a live coal from off the altar."

S. M.

ON SOCIAL LIBRARIES.

From the Christian Monitor, published in Richmond, (Vir.)

IN every populous neighborhood there ought to be, and easily might be, a social library. I am anxious to fix the attention of my fellow citizens upon this subject, and excite them to feel an interest in it. Let me ask the simple question, why has God made us rational and accountable beings? Is it that we may employ our faculties, and spend our lives, in eating, drinking, sleeping, and hoarding up riches without limit or object? Is it for such low purposes as these that our Creator has implanted within us the seeds of reason, fancy and taste; and has made us capable of exalted affections and enjoyments? No, surely. The mind is the better and higher part of our nature, and could never be designed by him who made it to be the mere servant of the body, the slave of mean and trifling pursuits. By our very constitution, God calls upon us to cultivate our minds with knowledge; to study, as we have opportunity, the various works of his hands, and especially his own inspired book; to the end that we may, in every thing, adore his wisdom, power, and goodness, and find a sublime felicity in these noble exercises.

Do you avow that you hate books, and care nothing about mental improvement? Well, this is candid. But be consistent. Proclaim yourself to be merely the smartest animal upon earth. Proclaim that you covet no gratifications more dignified than those of

sense and appetite. Renounce the claims of a reasonable being and a Christian.

Let me be rightly understood. It is not ignorance, simply considered, that I mean to censure; for I know that in a world like this, much ignorance is unavoidable. The thing that tries my patience, is the contempt of attainable information, the willing destitution of useful and ornamental knowledge.

I am aware, that it is vain to talk of instituting a social library, unless the people have some previous conviction of the value of books and reading. But let not the few who feel the importance of the object be too soon discouraged from making the attempt. If a good collection of books, though a small one, were once procured, it would excite and strengthen the taste for reading. Even those, who had the smallest degree of this taste, would be prompted to try whether they or their children could get any compensation from the library for the money which they had laid out upon it.

You plead perhaps, that though you would like to read, books would be of no account to you for want of time to peruse them. I answer that, granting there may be a few so situated, even in this happy, plentiful country of ours, it is generally not so. I must be permitted to say, from the surest kind of evidence, *I know better*. I know it to be possible, in a life of close labor and business, to redeem many an hour for reading. Only let a love of books be cherished, a thirst for knowing something beyond the bounds of one's own chimney corner. Especially let the knowledge of religious truth and duty be contemplated as a thing of high moment. Learn to check with rigor the degrading habits of idle running about, foolish talking, and useless sleep. It will then be found, probably beyond expectation, that much time may be redeemed for the purpose I am recommending. O that I could prevail with my readers heartily to make the experiment!

You plead that money is too scarce to expend much of it in buying books.—Stay a minute, if you please. How much money do you spend annually in *liquid fire*, as spirituous liquors have been justly and beautifully called; in costly finery of dress, which fosters the silliest vanity; and in other luxuries, childish and useless, if not pernicious? Or perhaps you are sinking into the vile servitude of avarice, which raises the cry of scarcity and want in the midst of abundance, and so goes on crying forever. But to answer your plea more directly, I admit that the expense of a large library is not easily to be borne by an individual, unless he be wealthier than is common. To obviate this very difficulty I am advising the formation of social libraries. Take a circle of about twelve miles in diameter. Let fifty heads of families, or others, within these bounds, pay five dollars a piece at the commencement, and one dollar a year additional for five years. The whole would amount to five hundred dollars. Let this money be judiciously laid out in the purchase of books on religious and other interesting subjects, to be deposited with a careful librarian as near the centre as practicable. What a rich and convenient treasure would this be to a large neigh-

borhood! And surely all this might be readily accomplished, if people were tolerably disposed to do it. I have seen a good many parts of Virginia in my time; and I think I am not acquainted with any neighborhood in which such an expenditure would be felt as a serious burden. In towns, the inducements to such institutions are still stronger than in country places. PHILANDER.

For the Panoplist.

SKETCH OF A PLAN FOR INSTRUCTING THE INDIANS.

IN a series of remarks, which were published in the last number of the Panoplist, I exhibited some of the motives, which should induce the churches in the United States, to engage in the great work of instructing the American Indians. I shall now suggest several things relative to the method, in which instruction may be most successfully communicated to them.

The plan, which I propose briefly to sketch out, appears to be adapted to the peculiar habits and dispositions of the Indians; to be dictated by past experience; and, as to all its important parts, to have been for several years successfully pursued among the Cherokees, by Mr. Blackburn.

It is generally admitted by those who have had any acquaintance with this subject, that but little permanent good can be expected from attempts to instruct the Indians, while they continue their wandering savage life. In order to civilize them, and attach them to settled habitations, two obvious methods present themselves. The one is, to take a certain number of youths from a tribe, and educate them in our own schools, in order that they may return, and instruct the rest; the other is, to establish schools in their own country, where the greater part of the children in a tribe may at once enjoy the advantages of instruction.

Against the first method, there are several objections.

1. Indian youths taken directly from a savage life, are not prepared to endure the close confinement and rigid discipline of our mode of education. They are likely either to be disgusted with their studies, or to be disheartened and sink into stupid indifference.

2. Finding themselves inferior, in refinement and knowledge, to the English youths with whom they may be connected, and imagining, perhaps not without reason, that their company is rather shunned than desired, they will be induced to associate with the vicious and unprincipled, who are always ready to greet with a smile any who will go with them in the road to ruin. It is undoubtedly owing to the influence of these causes, that so many of the Indian youths, who have been placed in our colleges and schools, have become dissipated worthless characters.

3. Supposing that they complete their education and return to their tribe, they have not forgotten their former habits, nor wholly

overcome their native propensities. Their inclination strongly disposes them to mingle with their former associates, their brothers and sisters, and to return to their former mode of living. And finding the current without so strong against civilization, they despair of making head against it, and return with scarcely a struggle to savage life.

The plan, which appears better calculated to succeed, is the one that contemplates the establishment of schools in their own country. If these were modelled on the Lancasterian plan, one school would be sufficient for the education of several hundreds of children. In these schools should be taught the rudiments of the English language, and the branches of learning usually taught in common English schools. There should be a work house, a large garden, and some cultivated fields contiguous to the school, where the children might occasionally be instructed in the most useful mechanical arts, and in agriculture. This will afford them a pleasant and profitable amusement, during a part of the time when they are out of school. For it should be remembered, that Indian children will not, at first, bear to be confined at study but a small part of the day. By a judicious course of instruction, we might hope to raise them gradually from one stage of improvement to another, without subjecting them to a discipline, that would be at once irksome and unprofitable.

As it is proposed, that these schools should be under the instruction of judicious and competent teachers, both male and female, the example of two or three families, who would be settled at such an establishment, would have a powerful and salutary influence on the tribe generally.

I think it decidedly better to teach the Indians to read and understand *our* language, than to teach them to read their *own*. As they have no *written* language, the labor of teaching them to read in a written language yet to be formed, would be as great as to teach them ours. There would also be the labor of translating the Bible and other books, which, considering the barrenness of the Indian language, would be an extremely difficult and arduous work.

By teaching them our language, we remove at a stroke, the grand obstacle to their instruction. We prepare them to enjoy the advantages of conversation, and give them, in some good degree, security against deception in their intercourse with the whites. And we place in their hands, not only the Bible, but every other book, which may instruct them. If the *parents* are unable to learn our language, the children may be their interpreters.

Mr. Blackburn found no objection to such a mode of instruction among the Cherokees, arising from any peculiar attachment to their native tongue. And from recent accounts we learn, that not only the Cherokees, but also the Chickasaws and Choctaws, three tribes whose population is about 30,000, are desirous that schools, on a similar plan, should be maintained among them.

It is admitted, that such an establishment would be expensive, especially in the first stages of it. The children must be fed and

clothed, at least in part. It is, however, probable, that it would not be many years, before the children would be able to do considerable towards supporting themselves. But we trust the means necessary to support such an establishment would not be wanting. In what way could the government of the United States erect a more noble and lasting monument, to testify its enlightened and generous policy, than by establishing schools for the instruction of the Indians.

I will only add, that the above plan is not mere theory. It has been tested by four years experience; and has received the approbation of gentlemen of talents and learning, who sustain important civil offices under the general government. During the above period, between four and five hundred children, belonging to the Cherokee tribe, learnt the rudiments of the English language, and a very pleasing progress towards civilization was made by the whole tribe. Had Mr. Blackburn received that aid in the prosecution of his enlightened and benevolent plan, which he justly merited, there is reason to believe that the Cherokees would, before this time, have arrived at a respectable stage of knowledge and refinement.

K. C.

For the Panoplist.

LETTER OF PLINY TO TRAJAN.

THE Unitarians have attempted to prove, that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was not held by the Christians of the first ages, but that it was introduced by platonizing philosophers about the beginning of the fourth century. To such an attempt we may oppose one authority, which never has been disputed, and which completely overthrows the opinion. The younger Pliny, who was proconsul of Bithynia, under the Emperor Trajan, wrote a letter to that Emperor, requesting instructions how he should treat the Christians in that province, ‘who had become numerous, both in the cities, towns, and country.’ ‘*Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam, atque agros, superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est.*’—In this letter, Pliny informs the Emperor, that it was the customary practice of the Christians to convene in the morning, before light, and severally to sing or repeat a hymn to Christ, as to God; [or as to a God.] The whole sentence in the original is as follows. ‘*Affirmabant autem hanc summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti statim die ante lucem convenire; carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem.*’*

Pliny was born before the death of St. Paul, about A. D. 62; and must have written this letter, when about forty or fifty years of age,

* “They declared,” i. e. on their examination before Pliny himself, “that the whole of their delinquency, whether we call it crime or error, was, that they were accustomed to assemble before light, on a fixed day, and to unite in singing, by alternate responses, a hymn to Christ, as God.” The reader will observe, that this is the declaration of the Christians themselves, and not of spies, or bystanders, who might be supposed in some danger of being mistaken. It will also be observed, that the direct religious worship offered to Christ, was so important a part of their religious exercises, as to be fixed upon by Pliny as the grand characteristic of them.

ED.

at the beginning of the second century; for Trajan died A. D. 117.

Pliny was a pagan, and his office, and probably his principles, led him to attempt the suppression of Christianity. He certainly could have no motive to state facts in support of any particular doctrine. We have then direct and indubitable evidence, that the Christians worshipped Christ, as God, within fifty years from the death of St. Paul, and two hundred years anterior to the time, when the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is alleged by Unitarians to have been introduced by the Platonic Christians.

A. A.

REVIEW.

A Letter to the Rev. Samuel C. Thacher, on the aspersions, contained in a late number of the Panoplist, on the Ministers of Boston and the vicinity.

By WILLIAM E. CHANNING, minister of the church of Christ in Federal Street, Boston. Third edition, with additional remarks. Boston: Wells & Lilly. 1815. [July.] pp. 36.

A letter to the Rev. William E. Channing, on the subject of his letter to the Rev. Samuel C. Thacher, relating to the review in the Panoplist on American Unitarianism. By SAMUEL WORCESTER, D. D. pastor of the Tabernacle Church, Salem. Third edition. Boston: S. T. Armstrong. 1815. [July.] pp. 36.

Remarks on the Rev. Dr. Worcester's letter to Mr. Channing, on the "Review of American Unitarianism," in a late Panoplist. By WILLIAM E. CHANNING, minister, &c. Second edition. Boston: Wells & Lilly. 1815. [August.] pp. 39.

Are you a Christian or a Calvinist? or do you prefer the authority of Christ to that of the Genevan Reformer? Both the form and the spirit of these questions being suggested by the late review of American Unitarianism in the Panoplist, and by the Rev. Dr. Worcester's letter to Mr. Channing. To which are added some strictures on both those works. By a LARMAN. Boston: Wells & Lilly. 1815. [August.] pp. 72.

A Second Letter to the Rev. William E. Channing, on the subject of Unitarianism. By SAMUEL WORCESTER, D. D. pastor, &c. Second edition. Boston: S. T. Armstrong. 1815. [August.] pp. 44.

Remarks on the Rev. Dr. Worcester's second letter to Mr. Channing, on American Unitarianism. By WILLIAM E. CHANNING, minister, &c. Boston: Wells & Lilly. 1815. [October.] pp. 48.

A Third Letter to the Rev. William E. Channing, on the subject of American Unitarianism. By SAMUEL WORCESTER, D. D. pastor, &c. Boston: S. T. Armstrong. 1815. [December.] pp. 80.

THE controversy, which has been carried on at Boston in the course of the last year, respecting modern Unitarianism, is certainly one of the most important theological discussions, in which our readers can ever be called to take an interest. It relates to all the essential articles of the Christian faith; to the object of religious worship, the moral condition of man, the penalty of the divine law, the way in which sinners are reconciled to God, the nature, character and offices of the Savior, the regard which is due to him, the evidences of piety, the authority of the Scriptures, and the state of mankind in the world to come. All these topics, with an immense variety of others, are involved in the controversy now before the

public. With the best reason, therefore, may we solicit the attention of all, who have at heart the prosperity of the church and the spiritual welfare of themselves and their fellow men, to whatever may be laid before them on these subjects in our pages, if written with the spirit of the Gospel, and with that care and solemnity which the momentous questions at issue require.

About a year since, a pamphlet was published at Boston, which professed to give an authentic history of Unitarianism in America. This pamphlet, as most of our readers know, was reviewed at some length in the Panoplist for June last. The review induced Mr. Channing to write his Letter to Mr. Thacher, and occasioned, more or less directly, the publication of all the pamphlets, whose title-pages are copied, at the head of this article. Several other pamphlets owed their existence to the same cause; but we do not learn, that any importance has been attached to them.

As many of our present subscribers were not subscribers to the last volume, we propose to give a brief recapitulation of the review here referred to, and then to enter upon the consideration of the publications before us. We are persuaded, indeed, that such a recapitulation will be useful to all, who wish to retain the prominent points of the controversy distinctly in their minds. Let us turn, then, to the review.

We began by mentioning the silent, secret progress of a defection from orthodoxy in Boston and the vicinity, in its downward course to the lowest Socinianism, and to the borders of infidelity. We took notice of the artifice, which has been practised by latitudinarians, in concealing their real opinions, and giving the public to understand, that they do not differ materially from their orthodox brethren. Of this artifice we gave an instance, which had recently occurred. That our readers might be aware of the meaning, affixed to the word **Unitarianism** by Mr. Belsham, the author of the history which we were reviewing, we gave ample extracts from his writings, and expressed the substance of those extracts, in our own language, by way of summary. We examined the opposition, which some persons feel, to all religious controversy; and endeavored to show, that it is often absolutely necessary. Conceiving that the essential doctrines of the Scriptures were covertly attacked, and that attempts were constantly made to undermine the foundations of the Christian's hope, we declared ourselves conscientiously bound to expose the evil, and to resist it, to the utmost of our ability. We then gave an abridged account of the rise and progress of Unitarianism in this country, and of its propagation in Harvard College, for the materials of which we relied principally on Mr. Belsham's authorities. A long letter, written by William Wells, jun. Esq. we quoted verbatim from the pamphlet. We took notice of the chastisement, which Mr. Belsham inflicted upon the Boston clergy, for their cowardice, as he evidently considered it, in not avowing their religious opinions. We described several characteristics of Unitarianism, such as the following: Its disciples propagate their creed by negatives; they ascribe their conversion

not to the Bible, but to the works of Priestley, &c.; they systematically praise each other, and detract from their opponents. We commended Mr. Belsham's frankness in declaring, that Trinitarians and Unitarians could not be fellow-worshippers in the same temple, and in urging a separation. We urged the same thing; and pointed out the temper and spirit, with which such a separation ought to be effected. We guarded against the charge of having given an unfair representation of the Unitarians in this country, and referred the reader to most evident and inecontrovertible proofs. The review was closed by some strictures on Mr. Wells's letter, which was taken as a specimen of the manner, in which the liberal party treat the opinions and characters of their antagonists.

Such is the substance of our review. We did not suppose it would be palatable to Unitarians; but we did most seriously intend, that it should afford them no just cause of complaint. That system of concealment, which has beyond all question been generally practised by them, demanded, as we thought, to be exposed with considerable severity. Whenever we stated facts, on any other authority than that of Unitarians themselves, we paid particular attention to the evidence by which the facts could be supported. We said nothing without deliberation; and we labored to express ourselves in such a manner, as to make no impression which was not strictly and literally correct, according to the most natural and obvious meaning of our words. It was with some surprise, therefore, though without the slightest apprehension or alarm, that we saw a number of most serious charges brought against us by Mr. Channing; charges not only serious in their import, but couched in the most unmeasured and violent language. To the examination of these charges we shall soon invite the attention of our readers.

Before we proceed to this examination, we must be indulged in saying, that controversial writings are often objected to, as descending to personalities, when there is no foundation in fact for the objection. If a writer falls at once into a violent passion, commits palpable blunders where it is easy to be correct, adopts the grossest sophistries, repeats misrepresentations which have been a thousand times detected, and appeals to violent prejudices in a strain of ranting declamation, it certainly may be very proper that these faults should be fairly exposed; and it is quite incorrect to stigmatize such exposure as containing mere personalities. To attempt victory in an argument by making an opponent personally odious, is altogether unjustifiable; but to exhibit the real delinquencies of the writer, is far from proving the existence of enmity or unkindness towards the man.

Shall we be pardoned in saying a word, as to the temper with which, unless we deceive ourselves, we enter upon this discussion? When Mr. Channing's letter first appeared, it was perused by us without the slightest feeling of ill-will toward the writer. We knew that he had done great injustice to our language, our arguments, and our intentions; and that his charges were in fact, and could easily be proved to be, perfectly groundless. Should full

credit be given to his representations, we knew that we must suffer extensively and severely; yet we had no anxiety for the issue. Time has shown, so far as we are capable of judging at present, that we had no cause for anxiety. Our actual sufferings, in consequence of Mr. Channing's attack, have as yet been so trifling as to defy computation; while the advantages, which we have derived from it, are important, and promise to be durable. Our readers will give us credit for coolness, when they consider that we have remained silent for nine months under charges of the most serious nature, preferred by a man of some influence and consideration, and tending to excite against us no small degree of popular animosity; charges, too, which we designed to refute, when the proper time should arrive. That time has arrived.

It may be asked, why we think it necessary, after so long a silence, to say any thing by way of reply to Mr. Channing? To this question we offer several answers. Some persons, (we hope their number is small,) are disposed to take silence for a confession of guilt. Others are unable to believe, till the fact is clearly proved, that high charges should be brought forward in a solemn and vehement manner, unless there is some foundation for them. But our principal answer is, that we think a just exhibition of the manner, in which this controversy has been conducted, will serve to illustrate the nature of the controversy itself. If it shall clearly appear, that Mr. Channing, with all his reputation at stake, has fallen into the grossest misrepresentations, made the most unwarranted statements, distorted the most innocent actions so as to give them an odious appearance, and written under the influence of a bitter temper; these things will afford some presumption, that the cause in which he is engaged is not a good one. In this point of view, the manner, the style, and the temper, of theological disputants are more important, than they are apt to imagine.

After making these observations, and, as we trust, feeling their applicability to the case before us, we shall certainly be very much to blame, if we indulge in violent language, or make a single unfair representation. We request the attention of our readers to this subject, with a particular desire that they should examine, with the utmost scrutiny, what we have to say. We shall be inexcusable, if, after patiently remaining silent so long, and professing to be dispassionate, we should become justly chargeable with the same faults, which we reprehend in others.

We propose in the first place, to examine the principal accusations preferred against us by Mr. Channing; secondly, to give a brief analysis and review of the discussion between Mr. Channing and Dr. Worcester; and, thirdly, to close with such miscellaneous reflections, as the state of the controversy seems to require.

Mr. Channing's first charge against our Review is that of *falsehood*. "Our conversation," says Mr. C. at the commencement of his letter to Mr. Thacher,—"Our conversation turned, as you recollect, on the *falsehood* of that Review; &c." p. 3. Mr. C. speaks again, on the same page, of "noticing the false and injurious

charges contained in this review." In several subsequent passages, the charge of falsehood is strongly implied. This charge is afterwards qualified as follows; p. 9. "That he [the Reviewer] intended to deceive, I am unwilling to assert; but the most charitable construction, which his conduct will admit, is, that his passions and party spirit have criminally blinded him, and hurried him into an act, which could have been authorized only by the strongest evidence, and the most impartial inquiry." This qualification is not inserted, however, in immediate connexion with the charges; but the mind of the reader is left, for some time, to be influenced by the direct unexplained charge of falsehood, brought forward with great assurance, and enforced by a most vehement style.

The manner in which Mr. C. supports his charge is now to be examined.

"The Panoplist Review," says Mr. Channing, "asserts, 1. That the ministers of this town and its vicinity, and the great body of liberal Christians, are Unitarians, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word."

"2. The Review asserts, that these ministers and liberal Christians are guilty of hypocritical concealment of their sentiments, and behave in a base, cowardly and hypocritical manner." pp. 4, 5.

In stating these assertions, Mr. C. does not use marks of quotation, but gives, as we are under the necessity of presuming, what he wishes his readers to receive for a correct account of what we had said. The first assertion he repeats in the same words; and there can be little doubt, that, if he had left the matter here, every reader would suppose him to have copied our words, though the marks of quotation had been accidentally omitted. The reason is very obvious. When one man undertakes to repeat what another man asserts, especially if the assertion is represented as a heavy crime, most persons would hold the accuser bound to give the very words of the assertion, and not quite different words, which his angry and agitated feelings might lead him to consider as expressing the same thing. After Mr. C. had given his statement of our assertion, he attempts to fortify it by three quotations from the Panoplist, in the following order; viz.

" "We feel entirely warranted to say, that the *predominant religion* of the liberal party is decidedly Unitarian, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word." " Pan. p. 267.

" "We shall feel ourselves warranted hereafter, to speak of the fact as certain, that Unitarianism," meaning Mr. Belsham's, "is the predominant religion among the ministers and churches of Boston." " p. 254.

" "The liberal party mutilate the New Testament, reject nearly all the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and degrade the Savior to the condition of a fallible, peccable, and ignorant man." " p. 271.

It will be observed, that in the second of these quotations, Mr. C. has inserted the words, "meaning Mr. Belsham's," as an innuendo. Against the correctness of this innuendo we utterly protest. It is absolutely unwarranted. The third quotation is not

given with verbal accuracy, as it stands in the Panoplist, where it is a series of connected members forming part of a long sentence; but we do not complain of this circumstantial variation as having imparted any new meaning. After protesting against the innuendo, we are prepared to defend as strictly true, all that is said in these quotations, if the passages are taken in their proper connexion, and understood according to the obvious import of the language, in which they are expressed. We have reason to complain, however, of the manner in which Mr. C. has brought forward these quotations.

In the first place, we regret that Mr. C. should have been willing to prepossess his readers against us, by stating in his own words, and in a most obnoxious form, the assertion which he attempted to fasten upon us. This statement he made with a tone of vast assurance, and in such a manner as to preclude all further thought or examination on the part of those, who reposed implicit confidence in his fairness and accuracy, or whose minds, already in a state of high exasperation, were prepared to be thrown into ungovernable rage by a small additional excitement. We need not say, that when a reader is in a violent paroxysm of anger, he is poorly qualified to detect any inaccuracy, either of fact, or argument. A candid man would indeed perceive, that Mr. C.'s extracts do not support his allegation; but even such a man might suppose, that Mr. C. had blundered upon the wrong passages; or that the passages quoted did in fact convey a meaning more favorable to his statement, if taken in their several connexions, than when considered in a detached form. Scarcely any man would easily be led to suppose, that Mr. C. had gravely and repeatedly charged us with making an assertion, which we never made. Yet this is the fact.

Secondly; we think Mr. Channing was quite unfair, in changing the natural order of the quotations. His first quotation stands in the Panoplist thirteen pages after the second. As the quotation, which he places first, contains the name of Mr. Belsham, to many readers it would appear to support the innuendo, which Mr. C. ventured to place in his second quotation. Let the reader decide for himself, whether this inversion of the natural order of the quotations could have been made for any other reason, than the one just stated. If he shall be of opinion that it could not, he will not hesitate long in deciding, whether such a course of proceeding is justifiable.

Thirdly; it was uncandid in Mr. C. to give the passages, which he quoted, as though they had been naked assertions; whereas they were given in the Panoplist expressly as *conclusions*, deduced from a great variety of facts, which had been distinctly stated. The proper way of answering the Review was, to take up its several parts in order, to re-examine the witnesses, and to form conclusions at the end of each head, rather than at the beginning. This would have been the course pursued by such men as the Edwardses and Witherspoon, in reference to any work which they might have

thought it their duty to answer. The last thing, which these illustrious men would have sanctioned by their example, is, to fly into a violent passion at the commencement of a discussion, and thus to disgust all readers, except those who can at once be roused into a similar passion. The profit, which this latter class of readers would derive from an angry dispute, can easily be estimated. We do not deny, that Mr. C. professes to examine some of the testimony, which we had brought forward; but this he does very cursorily, and evidently with less reliance on any such investigation, than on the vague and heated declamation with which his pamphlet begins and ends.

Fourthly; Mr. C. brings together from every part of our Review detached passages, for the purpose of proving, that we made a general and indiscriminate charge, not only against the liberal party, but against "the great body of liberal Christians." But he entirely omits to notice two passages, which we inserted with the express design of limiting and explaining what we had said concerning the liberal party. The passages are as follows:

"The great majority of those, whose influence goes to swell the importance of the liberal party, are not involved in most of the censures, which this Review implies, or expresses." p. 266.

"If individuals dislike Mr. Belsham as a leader; if they are not willing to be classed among his followers; let them declare their own opinions openly. But let them not yield all their countenance to Unitarians, and yet complain if ranked in the same class, by those who have no means of learning their opinions except by their conduct." p. 268.

Every person must see at once, that these passages are very important, in the inquiry concerning our assertions, as they were stated by Mr. Channing. Yet these passages are entirely overlooked: we will not say designedly; for it is a maxim of law and of common sense, that the suppression of truth, and the suggestion of falsehood, are equally criminal: but we think ourselves fully justified in saying, that if Mr. C. had been as much engaged in making a fair statement of what we *did* say, as in exciting the passions of his readers by laying to our charge things which we *did not* say, the sentences which we have just quoted would have been candidly cited and considered by him.

We have just intimated, that Mr. C. laid to our charge things which we did not say. This is easily shown. "The Panoplist Review asserts," says Mr. C. "that the ministers of this town and its vicinity, and the great body of liberal Christians, are Unitarians in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word." This assertion, which we are accused of having made, consists of two parts. We will consider them in their order.

First, we are charged with having asserted, 'that the ministers of Boston and its vicinity are Unitarians in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word.' The only passages which Mr. C. quotes, as proving that we made this assertion, are those to which we have already called the attention of our readers. Nothing is said, in either of these passages, of the ministers in the vicinity of Boston; nor is

any thing said concerning these ministers generally, in any part of the Review. Now, as the ministers in the vicinity of Boston are much more numerous, than the ministers in Boston itself, the greater part of Mr. Channing's allegation falls at once to the ground. Among the ministers in the vicinity of Boston, a large proportion are decidedly orthodox. We certainly never thought of classing these men with any of the sorts of Unitarians, whom Mr. Channing describes; nor did we ever thus class them. Nor did we say, in either of the passages quoted by Mr. Channing, or in any other passage, that the ministers of Boston were Unitarians, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word: nor did we say that the ministers of Boston generally were Unitarians in any sense of the word. Thus it appears, that not a single clause of this part of Mr. Channing's allegation can be supported by him. Let us now turn to the other part.

Secondly, we are charged by Mr. Channing with having asserted, "that the great body of liberal Christians are Unitarians, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word." It might be sufficient to say, at once, that this charge is totally unfounded. We never mentioned "the great body of liberal Christians," in the whole course of the Review. We very much question whether we ever used the phrase "liberal Christians," in any place, or on any occasion whatever. It is a phrase, which we can by no means consent to apply to such men as Mr. Belsham and his friends in Great Britain, or to the persons who constitute the liberal party in this country. The phrase is very well in itself; but they, who should be forward to claim it, as descriptive of their own character, might very probably be least deserving of such a distinction. By the words used by Mr. Channing, viz. "the great body of liberal Christians," we should suppose all those persons to be meant, in every part of the world, who profess to be Christians, and claim the epithet liberal. Concerning such a general, undefined, and various class of professed Christians, scattered throughout the world, we never thought of making any assertion. We spoke indeed of the *liberal party*; but this is quite a different thing. The phrase, *liberal party*, we have used, occasionally, for the want of a better. We have thought it as little offensive, as any other phrase, which could be invented to designate the latitudinarians in our country, who deny and oppose those doctrines of the Bible, which have been usually called the doctrines of the Reformation; and who, by cooperating to decry these doctrines, and the doctrines of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, have formed themselves into a *religious party*. Though we repeatedly spoke of the liberal party, we said nothing of the "great body" of that party; much less did we say, that the great body of that party were Unitarians, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word. Should we permit Mr. Channing to amend his charge, by inserting *liberal party* instead of *liberal Christians*, a favor which we are not under the smallest obligation to grant, still he could not substantiate what he has said. It is remarkable, that the only passage of the Review, which contains a description in any degree re-

sembling the phrase in question, viz. "the great body of the liberal party," implicitly disclaims the general, sweeping assertion, which Mr. C. charges us with having made. "The *great majority of those*," we say, "whose influence goes to swell the importance of the *liberal party*, are **NOT** involved in most of the censures, which this review implies, or expresses."

We have thus shewn, that we never made the assertions, which Mr. C. has laid to our charge. Let the reader here inquire, what sort of a controversial writer he must be, who brings forward his principal allegation in such a manner, as that not a single clause of it can be supported; and this, too, in a case where it was so perfectly easy to be accurate, and where all the errors, into which he has fallen, are the result of exaggeration.

We now proceed to state what we *did* assert, and to justify our assertions. It is necessary, in the first place, to ascertain in what sense we used the word Unitarianism, generally, throughout the Review. Our readers are doubtless aware, that the word Unitarian is claimed by all who refuse to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. As there have been a great variety of sects, uniting in the rejection of the Trinity, though disagreeing on many other points, it seems desirable to know, at the commencement of any inquiry concerning Unitarianism, in what sense that word is used by the writers or parties in question. We were about reviewing a history of American Unitarianism. The reader would naturally wish to know what *sort of Unitarianism* the historian professed to be writing about. We endeavored to satisfy this natural curiosity, by stating what Mr. Belsham wished his readers to understand, when *he* used the word Unitarianism. In doing this, we conducted the matter with the most perfect uprightness, not even suspecting it to be possible, that our representations could be either blamed or contradicted. We made large extracts from Mr. Belsham's writings, not for the purpose of insinuating that the liberal party in this country were responsible for these writings, but that our readers might have some just view of the opinions held by the historian of Unitarianism in America. This we expressed to be our design in making the extracts, and that this was a proper, fair, and laudable design we have no hesitation in affirming. After closing the extracts we say, "Such is the Unitarianism which Mr. Belsham wishes to propagate, and of which he professes to write the history; so far, at least, as relates to its progress in this country. Of the existence of such Unitarianism, in the metropolis of New-England, our readers have generally been well persuaded; &c." p. 247. The representation here made is strictly accurate. Mr. Belsham was writing the history of the lowest Socinianism, and not of any higher sort of Unitarianism; and that the lowest kind of Socinianism has existed in Boston, for some time past, is undeniable.

Whenever we used the word Unitarianism without restriction, we left it to be understood in its large and indefinite sense. This is very manifest from the fact, that in the sentence just quoted, and in another to be considered hereafter, we expressly restricted the

term to the religious system of Mr. Belsham; whereas, in the great majority of instances, we left it entirely unrestricted. Thus, when we enumerate several important doctrines of the Scriptures, p. 249, we say, they "they are points, in which we differ essentially from Unitarians." Now it is beyond all question the fact, that when the points there enumerated come to be explained, Trinitarians differ, in respect to them, from *Unitarians of every class*. When we said, that "we should feel ourselves warranted thereafter to speak of the fact as certain, that Unitarianism is the predominant religion among the ministers and churches of Boston," we left the reader to understand the word Unitarianism, precisely as he should find the evidence before him would authorize him to understand it. We certainly did not restrict the word to the system of Mr. Belsham, unless Mr. Wells had thus restricted it. Whether he had thus restricted it, or not, the reader could judge. Mr. Channing is very willing to admit, that Mr. Wells used the word Unitarianism in its large and indefinite sense; and yet when we use the same word, without restriction or explanation, immediately after quoting Mr. Wells's letter; and declare ourselves warranted to use it, in consequence of the testimony contained in that letter; Mr. C. will have it, that we meant something essentially different from any thing which was intended by Mr. Wells. We doubt whether an entire want of candor was ever more strikingly evident. Will it be said, that Mr. Belsham uses the word Unitarianism in a restricted sense, as descriptive of the lowest Socinianism; that Mr. Wells, being a disciple of Dr. Priestley, agrees substantially with Mr. Belsham in religious doctrine; that in writing a private confidential letter to Mr. Belsham, it might naturally be supposed that Mr. Wells would use language which his correspondent would be able to understand; and that the inference would naturally be, that Mr. Wells used the word in a restricted sense? If such should be the inference, we, surely, are not to blame. Mr. Wells did write the letter which we quoted. He wrote it to Mr. Belsham: and he ought to have known in what manner Mr. B. would naturally understand him. In the letter of Mr. Wells to the Editor of the Panoplist, which was inserted in the number for July last, p. 310, he explains his meaning as follows:

"I might not find it easy, and I do not think it at all necessary, to define precisely the sense in which I use the very general terms *Unitarian* and *Unitarianism*, but it would be very absurd to understand me as affirming, that all the gentlemen, of whom I speak, are Unitarians in precisely the same sense with Mr. B. A Christian, not a believer in the Trinity, I have been in the habit of denominating an Unitarian. Mr. B. contends for a more limited sense. I did not advert to this, and at that time, I believe, did not know it. The sense in which I use the term may serve to explain what is said in my letter, of "Unitarianism consisting rather in *not believing*," upon which the reviewer lays such stress."

If, as Mr. Wells says, it would be "very absurd to understand him as affirming, that all the gentlemen of whom he spoke are Unitarians in precisely the same sense with Mr. Belsham," is it less

absurd to understand us as affirming all this, when we take our words from Mr. Wells, and use them expressly on his authority? We have not the slightest reluctance to admit Mr. Wells's explanation of his meaning, though we think his letter contains some things, which seem to militate against it. For example; "Unitarianism," says he, "consists rather in *not* believing." Now this is exactly descriptive of the Unitarianism of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, which is little short of downright infidelity; but it by no means answers to the system taught by the author of *Bible News*, which requires more faith, not to say credulity, and is more completely enveloped in mystery, than any other system which can be named. Mr. Wells says, that 'he did not advert to the fact, that Mr. B. contends for a more limited sense of the word Unitarian,' and 'he believes he did not then know it.' For a friend and correspondent of Mr. B. to confess himself ignorant, or unmindful, of the meaning which this heresiarch affixes to a word, which he assumes as the distinguishing badge of his sect, is rather singular, and could hardly be expected. Mr. Belsham will receive Mr. Wells's explanation as but a poor compliment. But whatever may have been Mr. W.'s knowledge on the subject, it is unquestionably true, that modern Socinians have claimed the word Unitarian as belonging exclusively to those, who believe in the simple humanity of Christ. In Evans's Sketch of Religious Denominations, which was republished in this country in 1807, we find the following passage. "But the Socinians have appropriated to themselves the appellation of *Unitarians*; and by this name they are now more generally distinguished. Though to this appellation they have no exclusive claim, yet it is somewhat more correctly descriptive of their religious tenets than that of Socinians, since they renounce many of the opinions of Socinus." p. 52. We never said, be it remembered, that Mr. Wells used the word Unitarian in the sense given to it by Mr. Belsham, his correspondent; i. e., in the sense given to it by the sect, to which Mr. Wells himself belongs. Whether we thought so, or not, is immaterial; but we submit it to our readers, whether a man *might not* have said and thought so, without any impeachment of his understanding or his honesty.

In short, Mr. Wells says, "Most of our Boston Clergy and respectable laymen (of whom we have many enlightened theologians) are Unitarian." Taking the words from his mouth, and relying expressly on his authority, we say, "Unitarianism is the predominant religion among the ministers and churches of Boston." If Mr. Wells spoke the truth, we merely repeated it. If it should hereafter be proved, that Mr. Wells was mistaken, (which will not be proved,) still we could never be condemned for relying on his testimony. If Mr. Wells is permitted to explain what he meant by the word Unitarianism, it evinces a pitiable want of fairness to refuse us the benefit of his explanation. If it is absurd to suppose, that he meant any thing other than Unitarianism in a large and indefinite sense, it is perfectly clear that we asserted nothing more, than that Unitarianism, in the same large and indefinite sense, is

the predominant religion among the ministers and churches of Boston. That we were warranted to make this assertion, neither Mr. Channing, nor any other member of the liberal party, will hesitate to acknowledge. Mr. C. has stated his own views on this subject, as follows:

"But I have always abstained most scrupulously from every expression, which could be construed into an acknowledgement of the Trinity. My worship and sentiments have been Unitarian, in the proper sense of that word." *Letter*, p. 13.

"As to my brethren in general, never have I imagined for a moment, from their preaching or conversation, that they had the least desire to be considered as Trinitarians; nor have I ever heard from them any views of God, or of Jesus Christ, but Unitarian, in the proper meaning of that word." *ib.*

We hope Mr. C. will not charge us with *falsehood* for concluding, at the close of these extracts, as we concluded, at the close of Mr. Wells's testimony, that "Unitarianism is the predominant religion among the ministers and churches of Boston."

We now proceed to the consideration of the other principal passage, which is relied on to convict us of falsehood. It occurs thirteen pages after the one, which we have just disposed of, and is expressed as follows: "We feel entirely warranted to say, that the *predominant religion* of the liberal party is decidedly Unitarian, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word." We made this declaration as a conclusion, deduced from a great variety of facts, which were particularly stated. Whether the conclusion was warranted by the facts, or not, is a question, which we are very willing our readers should settle for themselves. We designedly restricted the word *Unitarian*; a proof, as we have already intimated, that when we did not thus restrict it, we supposed it would be interpreted with more latitude. We selected the words *predominant religion* with great care, as expressing the precise meaning which we wanted to communicate, and as giving, by a single phrase, the exact truth without any mixture of error. The sentence was repeatedly read to a friend for consultation and advice; and the result was, that, in our opinion, the description was perfectly accurate.

Writers are apt to be fond of their own language. They sometimes see, in their own phrases, a propriety which their readers will not be able to descry. It is very possible that we were not fortunate, in the selection of the obnoxious phrase. Had we foreseen, that it would be made the ground of heavy accusations, we should have explained the sentence, in which it occurs, as follows. By saying, that the predominant religion of the liberal party is Unitarian, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word, we intend, that those members of the liberal party, who believe in the simple humanity of Christ, and agree substantially with Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham in religious opinions, actually possess a *predominant influence* in the party to which they belong. We intend, that they possess a greater share of learning, of talent, of sectarian activity, and of influence in society, than all other classes of Unitarians put to-

gether. Possessing these qualities, their system of religion may, without impropriety, be called the predominant religion of the liberal party. Thus should we have explained, had we been aware that our language would need an explanation.

It will be observed, that we said nothing about *a majority of numbers*. This we could not do; for we had not the requisite information. The liberal party we knew to be divided into many classes. The number of persons belonging to each class it would be impossible for any man to state with accuracy. But the influence continually exerted was much less difficult to be estimated. On the question of numbers, Mr. C. represents himself and Mr. Thacher as agreeing, ‘that a majority of their brethren believe, that Jesus Christ is more than man, &c.’ This might be true consistently with our declaration. Whether it be so, or not, we have no adequate means of forming an opinion. Mr. C. afterwards gives it as his estimate, that those ‘who believe the simple humanity of Jesus Christ, form a small proportion of the great body of Unitarians, in this part of the country.’ We have no confidence at all in the accuracy of this estimate. We do not believe that Dr. Freeman, or the Layman, will admit it to be accurate. Though we do not profess ourselves able to form an estimate of the numbers, belonging to the different sub-divisions of the liberal party, yet we are much mistaken if the Socinians, added to those who have no fixed opinions concerning the character of our Savior, would not greatly outnumber all other classes of Unitarians in our country. But it is not probable that the question of numbers will ever be settled in this world; nor is it material that it should be.

We now turn, for a few moments, to the inquiry whether the Socinians had, or had not, a predominant influence in the liberal party, at the time the Review was written. We considered Harvard College as under the control of men, who published the General Repository, and praised the Improved Version. If so, it is unquestionably under the control of Socinians. The General Repository was published by gentlemen holding offices of instruction and government in the College. It is notorious that one of these gentlemen was the Editor, and that others were contributors. A printed circular letter was issued, stating the extraordinary qualifications of this Editor, and earnestly soliciting subscriptions to the work; and this circular was signed by a most active member of the corporation of the College, (the same who wrote a wonderfully temperate pamphlet, which we shall notice presently,) and by two persons of distinction in Boston. The President of the College will not deny, that he was friendly to the General Repository. That work was doubtless intended to be the great instrument of propagating Unitarianism in this country; and the Unitarianism, which it labored to propagate, was evidently Socinianism. Mr. Channing does not deny this; but simply declares, that ‘he has heard some of its sentiments disapproved by the majority of those with whom he has conversed.’ Be it so. ‘This may only prove, that Mr. C. convers-

ed more, on the subject of the General Repository, with those Unitarians who agree with him in sentiment, than with others. All this is very natural. In regard to the Monthly Anthology, Mr. C., says 'he has read as little of that work as of most periodical publications;' but that Mr. Thacher has informed him, 'that the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ is not once asserted in it.' Very likely. It has not been the habit of Unitarians to avow all their opinions clearly, not even in their anonymous writings. But there are articles in the Anthology, which any person of judgment must pronounce to have been written by Socinians. The indecent levity with which the most sacred doctrines are ridiculed, and the contemptuous manner in which the orthodox are treated, declare plainly enough the school, in which the writers learned their logic and their manners.

It is worthy of remark, that Mr. Channing seems disposed to pay a very slight regard to the Anthology and the Repository; and to pass over them, as though they had been the productions of nobody, and nobody was responsible for them. We have observed the same disposition in other members of the liberal party. Is it then a fact, that either of these works had a dubious and obscure origin; and that they are to be considered as mere foundlings, disowned and deserted by all? Of the direction, under which the Repository was issued, we have already spoken. If ever a party was responsible for a publication issued under its auspices, continued by its patronage, conducted by its most distinguished members, and uniformly subservient to its cause, the liberal party in Boston and the vicinity are responsible for both the works in question. The Anthology was edited by those clergymen and laymen of the liberal party, who have been most praised by each other, and by the party generally, for their learning, their talents, their catholicism, and many other excellent qualities. Mr. Belsham, on the other side of the Atlantic, is loud in his praises of that work, and of the Repository. Yet Mr. C. intimates, that he has read little of the Anthology. This is but a sorry tale to tell his brethren, who doubtless supposed, that none but bigots could shut their eyes against the light, which shone from the pages of their favorite work. But whether Mr. C. read the Anthology little or much, his brethren were deeply engaged in providing materials for it. They met weekly to confer respecting it, and to conduct its affairs; and they wrote all the prominent articles which it contained. Their fostering care was continued, till, as Dr. Morse has well observed, "it sunk under the weight of its own sins;" and, after a moderate interval, the Repository arose as its successor, and was published by the same class of men. We must be permitted, therefore, to assign their proper importance to the articles which appeared in both these works.

To conclude what we have to say on this topic, there can be no doubt that the Repository was the favorite child of those, who had a predominant influence in giving theological instruction at Harvard College. The Repository was not only Socinian in its influence

generally, but seemed to take particular pleasure in bestowing emphatical praise upon the Improved Version of the New Testament; a sectarian work, which was published by Mr. Belsham and his friends. What stronger evidence can be required of us, that the College was under the influence of Unitarians, who harmonize with Mr. Belsham? It may be added, that the corporation of Harvard College consists of but six members beside the President; that two of these gentlemen belong to Dr. Freeman's society, and that one of the two is considered as decidedly the most active member of the corporation.

It is proper to observe, that in judging of the religious character of the College, we do not refer to those instructors, whose province has no particular connexion with theology. What the religious opinions of these gentlemen are, the public, we believe, have no means of determining.

If the College is Unitarian in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word, it follows almost of course, that the predominant religion of the liberal party is this kind of Unitarianism. The College is intended to exert, and does actually exert, a prodigious influence. The religion which is prevalent there will be the prevalent religion of the party.

Besides, it is to be remembered, that those gentlemen, who are known to be Socinians, and who possess great influence not only in reference to the College, but in reference to other important subjects, receive the unqualified support of the whole liberal party. This is a very material consideration. Mr. C. will not pretend, for a moment, that a gentleman's agreeing precisely with Mr. Belsham would form any objection to his being elected a member of the corporation, or established in a professorship.

We gave no opinion as to the kind of Unitarianism, which prevailed in Boston. But let us look at the religious state of this metropolis, when the Review was written. Over the Congregational, Episcopalian, and Baptist churches, there were sixteen pastors. Of these, seven were known to be decided Trinitarians. It is probable, that all the remaining nine are claimed by the liberal party. When our Review first appeared, and we were so loudly charged with falsehood, it was unhesitatingly admitted, that three clergymen in Boston were Unitarians of the Priestleian school. Now we humbly conceive, that three form no despicable proportion of nine. It might be true, without supposing any miracle, that three should have a predominant influence over six. Had we asserted, that Unitarianism of Mr. Belsham's sort was the predominant religion of the liberal party in Boston, a mere statement of numbers, such as we have given, would by no means prove us mistaken. About two months before our Review was written, one clergyman was settled in Boston and another was dismissed. The latter gentleman is, we believe, considered as a Socinian by the liberal party. He has probably been praised more by the party, within two years past, than any four of their most distinguished men; and this is saying a good deal. If not a Socinian of the lowest class, which we believe

to be the fact, he is totally opposed to the scheme taught in a book, which has the modest title of *Bible News*. It appears, then, that the clergymen in Boston, who were generally reputed Socinians, were *four* in number, but a short time before the Review was written; and that all the other clergymen of the liberal party, in that town, were but *five*. There have been many changes among the clergy of Boston within six years past, and it is not always easy to ascertain the relative influence of numerous individuals of the same party; but of this we are confident, that, during the whole course of the period mentioned, the Socinian part of the Boston clergy has received twice, if not five times, as much praise, as all the other Unitarian clergy of the town. Praise may not be a very exact measure of influence; but where an exuberance of praise is bestowed, it is natural to suppose that some influence is possessed. It is our deliberate opinion, that those clergymen in Boston, who, for several years past, have favored Socinianism rather than any higher kind of Unitarianism, have possessed more talents, more learning, more activity, and more influence, than the rest of the Unitarian clergy of Boston. In this opinion we may be mistaken; but it is by no means peculiar to ourselves.

If we look at the "respectable laymen," who are declared by Mr. Wells to be Unitarian, those of them, who are generally reputed Socinians, are by no means to be disregarded, in settling the question of influence. The congregation of Dr. Freeman contains many persons, who have no small share of weight in society. Of these we have mentioned two, as members of the corporation. Nor are the lay Socinians of Boston confined to the congregation of Dr. Freeman. We do not think that Mr. Wells should be entirely overlooked. He is a man of literature; and, in consequence of his connexion with the press, we doubt whether he has been second to any one, in the services which he has rendered to the Unitarian cause. Leaving the metropolis, nearly all the laymen of the liberal party, who have been extolled for their learning, and their biblical erudition, have been represented to us as Socinians.

On the whole, we solemnly declare to our readers, that we have taken into consideration the reputed learning, talents, and influence, of all the prominent individuals of the liberal party; we have looked at these gentlemen, one by one, and endeavored to make an impartial estimate of their relative and aggregate influence; we have done this repeatedly, both before and since our Review was published; and the result has uniformly been a conviction, that the predominant religion of the liberal party is Socinianism; i. e. Unitarianism in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word. By this we do not intend, that the open, fixed, avowed Socinians form a majority of the liberal party; but that these persons, and their adherents, exert a greater power in forming the religious character of this country, than is exerted by all other classes of Unitarians.

In forming this opinion, we have considered, that as Socinians are more fixed in their religious tenets, than their Unitarian brethren are, or ever have been, the influence of Socinians is directly

and constantly operative in the promulgation of their peculiar doctrines; while the influence of other Unitarians, so far as it relates to this subject, is principally exerted to produce a disbelief of the doctrines of the Trinity and the proper Divinity of Christ, leaving their converts in a state of endless vacillation and perplexity, in regard to the character of our Savior, till they gradually sink down into Socinianism. Dr. Freeman evidently considers the negative preaching, which he has so well described, as favoring his own religious system. It is to be observed, further, that the most popular Socinian writers do not hesitate to charge every species of Arianism with the grossest absurdity; and to stigmatize as idolatry that inferior kind of religious homage, which the higher classes of Unitarians render to Christ. Thus Socinians are able to direct against Arians many of the most plausible arguments, which the latter allege against the doctrine of the Trinity. This gives them no inconsiderable advantage. We do not believe, that Unitarianism, in any form, is about to prevail in this country; but, should it prevail, we have no doubt it will appear under the character of open, avowed, Socinianism, which, in the opinion of Mr. Belsham and his friends, is the only consistent Unitarianism.

The remaining passage, which Mr. Channing quotes from our Review, for the purpose of supporting his charge of falsehood, is the following: "The liberal party mutilate the New Testament, reject nearly all the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and degrade the Savior to the condition of a fallible, peccable, and ignorant man." We cannot do better, in reference to this passage, than to quote the vindication of it, which is to be found in Dr. Worcester's First Letter. We are happy to give this long quotation, not only because it is a perfect vindication of ourselves, but because it is a fair specimen of the upright, honorable, and forcible manner, in which Dr. W. conducts his discussion. If our readers suppose us biased in favor of a friend and advocate, all he have to say is, *let them judge for themselves.*

"This is the last of the three passages which you have cited to shew that the "Review asserts, that the ministers of Boston and the vicinity, and the great body of liberal Christians, are Unitarians, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word," and upon which you ground your principal accusation of falsehood. But is it here asserted, that all the individuals of the liberal party actually do the things, and all of them, which the party is said to do? Is this a fair interpretation of the passage? Or if it admits of this, does it fairly admit of no other?

"The apostles, Sir, as you very well know, repeatedly charge the Jewish rulers and people, generally, even "the great body" of the nation, with having "crucified and slain the Lord of life and glory." Yet, as you also know, but a very small part of that great body actually imbrued their hands in his blood. But some of them did; and of the rest, some more, and others less directly, consented to the deed. Hence they were generally involved in the guilt, and brought under the charge; and upon the great body, eventually, "wrath came to the uttermost." Such was the judgment of the apostles; and such the judgment of Him, whose throne is established in righteousness.—And, Sir, if among the liberal party, the things charged by the Reviewer are done; if some of the party do actually, "mutilate the New Testament,

reject nearly all the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and degrade the Savior to the condition of a fallible, peccable, and ignorant man,"—and of the rest, some more, and others less directly, consent to all this; if, as a party, or as individuals of the party, they bear no decided testimony against these deeds, and do nothing effectually to secure, or to purge themselves from the guilt of them; then, is it not true, and right, and proper to say of the party generally, that they do these things? and will they not generally, with all who adhere to them, be held to answer for them at the bar of the righteous Judge?

"But are not these things done:—I tremble, my dear Sir, while I put this question to your conscience:—tremble, not because I feel that I am doing wrong; but because I consider it a question of infinite solemnity.—It surely will not be denied, that "the New Testament is mutilated;"—it will not be denied, that "the Savior is degraded to the condition of a fallible, peccable, and ignorant man;"—nor should it any more be denied, that "nearly all the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel are rejected." I do believe you will yourself admit, that nearly all the doctrines are rejected, which by the venerable founders of the New England churches were held as fundamental;—which the great body of the Protestant churches, since the Reformation, have held as fundamental.

"How great a proportion of the liberal party actually do all this, and to how great an extent the rest of them consent to it, I would be devoutly thankful, that I am not particularly concerned to determine. But I must seriously ask, whether, from the representations made in your Letter, were there no other means of judging in the case, there would not be most fearful reason to apprehend, that you and your liberal brethren generally have done but very little to secure yourselves from the general charge; or, I must add, to purge yourselves from the general guilt?—It grieves me, dear Sir, to state, that in your Letter, you tell us, in so many words, that "to believe with Mr. Belsham is no crime:"—by which I understand, no sin,—no offence against God—against Christ—against the Gospel—against the cause and kingdom of truth and holiness.—No sin—no offence, to hold Christ to have been no more than "a fallible, peccable, and ignorant man;"—to discard those parts of the New Testament which assert his pre-existence, his miraculous conception, his divinity, and his atonement, as either spurious, erroneous, or extravagantly hyperbolical;—to deny that his death was an expiatory sacrifice for sin, that "we owe him any gratitude for the benefits which we are now receiving," that "we have any reason to hope for his future interposition;"—to deny the inspiration of the Scriptures generally, and reject all the fundamental, all the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel!—You are also most studiously careful, most exquisitely tender, lest any "statement you make should be considered, as casting the least reproach on those amongst us, who believe in the simple humanity of Jesus Christ;" and, of course, agree with Mr. Belsham, if not in all, yet certainly in the most material articles of his creed:—most studiously careful, most exquisitely tender, lest you should wound their feelings, abridge their influence, or hinder their success in propagating their sentiments! And from other parts of your Letter, it would seem that such has been the uniform feeling, and conformable to it the uniform practice, not only of yourself, but of your liberal brethren in general.

"Now, Sir, if such is the real fact, however small a proportion of the liberal party those may be, who actually do the things in question; yet is it not perfectly correct to say, generally, that the liberal party do them. And if so, where is the foundation for the serious charge of falsehood, so vehemently urged against the Reviewer?" pp. 10—12.

It is in the way, which Dr. W. describes, and in that way only, that a *party* can ever be made responsible for any thing. The leading, prominent, active members of a party are always comparatively few. Those, who do not act on a large scale, are responsible for

yielding their influence to others who do act thus. This matter is always perfectly understood in politics. Suppose the leader of a political party to be chargeable with certain alleged misconduct; is it impossible that the party should be made responsible for it? By no means. If the leader in question is notoriously a leader of the party, and if the party do not protest against his conduct, or disclaim it; especially if they give him new proofs of their confidence, and do all in their power to sustain and augment his influence, they are undoubtedly, in the eye of conscience, and of God, responsible for what he has done.

Whether the liberal party patronized the Improved Version of the New Testament, or not, we shall not now examine. On this topic, we refer the reader to what was said in our number for April, 1813. Whatever may be said by Mr. C. or any one else, we *positively know*, that the liberal party patronized that work. To explain ourselves, we *know* that leading members of the party greedily purchased it, gave it away in charity, urged others to do the same, applauded it, and publicly declared concerning it, in the General Repository, that it is "a version far more faithful, more correct, and more intelligible, than that in common use." We fully believe, that leading members of the party once intended to bestow it in charity, under the sanction of Bible Societies. Our belief is founded, in part, on the opposition expressed by some of these leading members to the formation of a certain Bible Society, which opposition was supported by the express declaration, that the persons who made it were unwilling to give away the Bible in our common version. And if the Improved Version is "far more faithful, more correct, and more intelligible, than that in common use," as it is declared to be, in a work published by gentlemen, who hold offices of instruction and government in Harvard College, why should it not be given away by Bible Societies? Though Mr. C. would seem to disapprove of this version, it is remarkable that his disapprobation, (if disapprobation it can be called,) is couched in the mildest terms. "I can scarcely remember an individual," says he, "who, in speaking of this version, has not expressed an unfavorable opinion at least of some of its notes." Is this all? If so, it goes but a little way towards proving, that the liberal party did not patronize the work. Many an individual might be very much engaged in circulating a book, and yet 'express an unfavorable opinion of some of its notes.' The Editors of the Improved Version have most audaciously rejected whole chapters of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke; and this, by their own confession, against the authority of all the manuscripts and versions extant; they have explained away nearly all the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and wrested the whole New Testament, so that it may speak the language of their sect; and yet, all that Mr. C. can find in his heart to say against this version, is expressed in the cautious and guarded sentence just quoted. It is of very little consequence, whether Mr. C. pronounces a faint or a full condemnation of the Improved Version. The weakness and absurdities of

that work have been set in so clear a light by Magee, Nares, Lawrence, and others, that it can never sustain any character, but a bad one; and must gradually sink into oblivion, the efforts of the General Repository to uphold it notwithstanding.

We must bestow a word or two upon the following passage in Mr. Channing's Letter.

"The conduct of the Reviewer, in collecting all the opinions of that gentleman, [Mr. Belsham,] not only on the Trinity, but on every other theological subject, in giving the *whole* collection the name of *Unitarianism*, and in exhibiting this to the world as the creed of liberal Christians in this region, is perhaps as criminal an instance of unfairness, as is to be found in the records of theological controversy." p. 7.

After the preceding discussions, it cannot be necessary that we should go into a particular examination of this charge.

We did not 'collect all the theological opinions of Mr. Belsham; but those opinions only, which relate to the most important subjects of Divine Revelation.' It was obviously proper to give his views on these subjects, as our readers could in no other way be made acquainted with the prominent features of his theological system; and Mr. C. knows very well, that the tendency of a *system* is not apparent to all readers, from the mere statement of a particular doctrine. The various parts of Mr. Belsham's scheme are dependent upon each other. The history of modern Unitarianism clearly proves, that when the doctrine of the Trinity is rejected, the descent is rapid, and almost uniform, to the lowest kind of Socinianism. This is the last stage, in the course toward downright, avowed, infidelity. It is impossible to go further, and claim the appellation of Christians. But other classes of Unitarians are in a state of perpetual fluctuation, doubt, and uncertainty. They cannot describe their own creed, so that the description shall answer for any length of time.

We did not 'give to this collection the name of Unitarianism.' Mr. Belsham, indeed, claimed that word, as the property of himself and his friends; and we have seen from Evans, that the claim has been extensively admitted. Mr. B. did not speak in his own name only, but in the name of his party; and the same party, on both sides of the Atlantic, now use the name as strictly, and often as exclusively, appropriate to themselves.

We did not 'exhibit this collection as the creed of liberal Christians in this region.' There is nothing to warrant such an assertion, unless it be the passages, which have been already considered. How far they warrant it, we leave others to decide.

We remark here, that if our Review did not properly describe the liberal party, as to its sub-divisions, and their relative influence, our deficiency must be ascribed to the facts, that Mr. Belsham was the historian of the party, and that we placed much reliance on him and his Boston correspondents; and to another notorious fact, that many of the clergy of the liberal party have, till lately, studiously concealed their religious opinions. We say *till lately*,

because a considerable change has taken place, in this particular, since our Review was published. From Mr. Channing's account of his own preaching, we think it would be impossible for his hearers to tell what sort of Unitarianism he held. With what propriety, then, could he demand of us, that we should know in exactly what class he, and his particular friends, ought to be reckoned? Mr. Belsham wrote a professed history of Unitarianism in this country. He gave his authorities without hesitation or reluctance; and he was no stranger to the party of whom he wrote. He has been visited by clergymen of the liberal party, who have been in England; we are informed they preached in his pulpit; and he has corresponded with others. He supposed he knew the party in this country perfectly well, and was abundantly able to write their history. We believe he knew much more about their religious doctrines, than it was easy for an orthodox man to know. While we relied upon the testimony of Dr. Freeman and Mr. Wells, we felt ourselves on safe ground. But had we attempted to go beyond these authorities, and write a particular history of the various opinions held by all the clergy of the liberal party, we should have found ourselves deplorably destitute of materials.

From what has already been offered in this article, it must appear, we think, even to Mr. Channing himself, that the charge of *falsehood* is not the proper charge to be preferred against us, if we had made an erroneous estimate of the influence of Socinians. How often do men mistake, in weighing the influence of different political parties? or of different and jarring interests in the same party? And how indecorous is it, how ungentlemanly, to stigmatize every such error as a falsehood? Look, for example, at the present state of France. Men of intelligence, who have resided long at Paris, are now divided in opinion, as to what were the real wishes of a majority of the French people, in reference to Napoleon and the Bourbons, in the spring of 1814, and the fall of that year, in the spring of 1815, and subsequently to the battle of Waterloo. Some of these men are doubtless mistaken in their estimate of parties. Shall they of course be charged with falsehood? We mean not to admit, that there is any good reason to suppose the statement, which we made, to be erroneous. But if it had been *proved* to be erroneous, which is far enough from the fact, a vehement charge of falsehood would never have been resorted to, unless the mind of Mr. C. had been in a state very different from that, which is favorable to a dispassionate inquiry after truth.

There is one more passage in Mr. Channing's Letter, which a proper regard to our own character induces us to examine. It is that, in which we are accused of having "distorted" a part of Mr. Wells's letter to Mr. Belsham. In an early part of the Review, we had quoted the whole of this letter; and towards the close of our discussion we offered some remarks upon it, quoting phrases and parts of sentences, as is universally customary, when writers are commenting on passages, which have been previously quoted, or which are already sufficiently known to their readers. Among

these parts of sentences, thus quoted from Mr. Wells's letter, a passage occurs, which evidently gave Mr. C. no common degree of pain. After mentioning it, and laying it before his readers, he gives vent to his feelings in the following words.

"This passage, as it stands in the Review, has the marks of quotation, as if taken from Mr. Wells's letter. Let me ask you to look back, and compare it carefully with the second sentence, which I have extracted from that letter. You perceive, that by mutilating that sentence, and by printing the last words in Italics, the reviewer has entirely done away the meaning of Mr. Wells, and contrived to give to the common reader a directly opposite impression to what that gentleman intended to convey. An unperverted mind turns with sorrow and disgust from such uncharitable and disingenuous dealing; and why all this labor to distort what is so plain? The object is, to fix the character of knaves and hypocrites on a large class of Christians and Christian ministers. I might here be permitted to dip my pen in gall; but I do not write for those, whose moral feeling is so dull, as to need indignant comment on practices like these." p. 12.

In this paragraph we are plainly charged with having mutilated a passage in Mr. Wells's letter, for the purpose of giving a false impression, and of fixing the character of knaves and hypocrites on men, who do not deserve such a character. The language of Mr. C. evidently assumes it as an undoubted fact, that we had incurred the guilt of wilful and malicious falsehood, perpetrated in a very base manner, and for a most detestable purpose. If this representation of our conduct is a just one, we freely confess that it admits of no excuse nor apology; and that nothing but the sincerest penitence, and the amplest reparation, could be urged as a reason why a sentence of severe reprobation should not be pronounced against us. We have always considered, and wished our readers to consider, a designed misquotation, made for the purpose of injuring a writer, or any other person, as one of the foulest crimes. It is a crime not unfrequently committed, in this fallen world; but, like many other crimes, it is not unfrequently charged upon the innocent. Of this every person must be convinced, who has read much controversy, either literary, political, or religious. When a writer feels himself in difficulty, it is an easy matter to raise a clamor about misrepresentation, or misquotation. It would be a wonder if he could not say some things, on these topics, which would appear plausible to superficial readers, or to those who are willing to take his word without examination. It is impossible to quote whole chapters, whole paragraphs, or even whole sentences, every time an author is alluded to, unless the reviewer is disposed to inumber his discourse, so as to make it intolerably tedious to every reader.

We have always been religiously scrupulous on this subject. We have been uniformly careful not only to give the meaning, but the words, of the writer; and when we have found it necessary to quote phrases and parts of sentences, we have been particularly cautious that no injustice should be done through haste or inattention. A careless misquotation we think should be severely blamed;

a wilful one, utterly abhorred. Whether we have erred through carelessness, let the readers of our past volumes examine and decide. That we have never been guilty of a wilful misquotation, we certainly know. We should as soon think of robbing on the highway.

Let us now look at the passage, which Mr. C. accuses us of having misquoted for so base a purpose. This passage, as it was published in the Panoplist, p. 253, where it forms a part of Mr. Wells's letter to Mr. Belsham, and is accurately printed from the London copy of Mr. Belsham's book, reads as follows: "Most of our Boston Clergy and respectable laymen (of whom we have many enlightened theologians) are Unitarian. Nor do they think it at all necessary to conceal their sentiments upon these subjects, but express them without the least hesitation when they judge it proper." In examining Mr. Wells's letter, we thought our readers would be gratified by seeing, in a connected view, a long string of laudatory epithets, which Mr. W. had bestowed upon the liberal party and their cause. After quoting a high-sounding catalogue of honorable qualities, which he had attributed to his own party, we selected the persons, whom he had distinguished by his praises. The list may be found at page 269, and runs thus: "When we come to persons, we find "Mr. Norton, an excellent young man," "the very worthy and learned Dr. Ware," "Dr. Kirkland the president," "most of the Boston clergy and respectable laymen, (many of whom are enlightened theologians,) who do not conceal their sentiments, but express them, *when they judge it proper*," and "Judge Thatcher, an excellent man and most zealous Unitarian;" these are drawn up in battle-array, in the liberal ranks." Now the reader will easily see, that if we had quoted all the sentences, from which the foregoing phrases are taken, we should have merely re-quoted a great part of Mr. W.'s letter; a mode of proceeding, which would have been altogether futile, as we had previously given the whole letter. We do not suppose, that Mr. C. is to be understood as blaming the mere quotation of phrases and parts of sentences; for he quotes in scarcely any other way. But it is the alleged alteration of Mr. Wells's meaning, which he so strongly condemns. On this point we are at issue with him. We deny that the meaning of Mr. W. was altered, in any other manner than is implied in making a fair abridgement; and, as to the correctness of this denial, we confidently appeal to our readers. When we wrote the abridged sentence, we were particularly careful that Mr. W. should not suffer from it. We considered, indeed, that the passage was weakened by any abridgment; but the alteration, inconsiderable as it was, appeared to us favorable to the party which Mr. W. was describing. We should have much preferred giving the whole of Mr. W.'s two sentences, even for the purpose which we then had in view, could we have done it, and yet form the whole string of encomiums, so that they could be read in continuity. This we endeavored to do, but were not able. Mr. C. says, that the passage "has the marks of quotation, as if taken from Mr. Wells's letter."

We reply, that it is taken from Mr. W.'s letter, though in an abridged form. He adds, that "the reviewer has entirely done away the meaning of Mr. Wells." This we totally deny; and we regret much that Mr. C. did not state *what that meaning is*, which we had done away. He proceeds to allege, that we "contrived to give to the common reader a directly opposite impression to what that gentleman intended to convey." We are here again obliged to content ourselves with a positive denial; for Mr. C. does not vouchsafe us any explanation of what he means by that "*directly opposite impression*," which we had "contrived to give to the common reader." We can see but one meaning, which any reader, common or uncommon, can gather from the passage in question, either in its original or its abridged form. Does not Mr. Wells say, that "most of the Boston clergy and respectable laymen do not conceal their sentiments?" He says, at least, that 'they do not think it necessary to conceal their sentiments on these subjects;' by which we supposed him to mean, that they do not, *in fact*, conceal their sentiments. Does he not say, that these clergymen and laymen 'express their sentiments, *when they judge it proper?*' He says, that they "express them," [their sentiments,] "without the least hesitation, when they judge it proper." Where is the mighty difference between these statements? Where is the occasion for the vehement wrath, which Mr. C. poured forth on this subject? We shall be told, perhaps, that the difference is too clear to require to be specified; and that our crime is too flagrant to need a particular exposure. Such language is very cheap; and it may answer in the circle in which Mr. Channing moves; but, he may rest assured, it will answer no where else.

It appears, however, from Mr. Channing's Remarks on Dr. Worcester's first letter, that our principal criminality lies in printing the last five words of the quotation in Italics. The phrase, "*when they judge it proper*," seems to have wonderfully discomposed the minds of Unitarians. We supposed it would; not because it is printed in Italics; but because it is one of those important circumstances, which add greatly to the value of Mr. W.'s testimony, and which prove, more conclusively than direct assertions, the concealment which has been practised by the liberal party. Mr. C. alleges, in the pamphlet last referred to, p. 34, that the printing of this clause in Italics "entirely changes the meaning of the sentence." How it does this, and what the meaning is before the change, and what afterwards, Mr. C. does not inform us; nor can we even conjecture what the complaint of Mr. C. amounts to, unless it be, that we did very wrong to call the attention of our readers to the clause in question. We presume the legitimate use of Italics to be comprehended in this simple rule; viz. that a reviewer, or any other writer, may print in Italics any quoted phrase or sentence, to which he wishes to direct the mind of the reader. All that we understand by the use of Italics, in quoted passages, is, that the person who quotes, and not the original writer, is desirous of calling attention to such passages. The practice of the **Christian Observer**, and of

every respectable modern work, is conformed to this rule. Nay, the practice of Mr. C. himself is conformed to the same rule; for he often prints in Italics quoted passages, which are not thus marked by the original writers. It by no means follows, that every clause, which is, or may be, of great importance, is considered to be important by the writer. Far from it. On the contrary, many of the most important circumstances seem to owe their appearance to mere accident, or inadvertence. In the production and examination of oral testimony, it often happens, that great stress is justly laid upon a word, or a phrase, which the witness himself did not think of any importance whatever; and which he is surprised to find taken up and dwelt upon with such interest. We feel, therefore, that we had a perfect right to print the words, "*when they judge it proper*," in Italics; that we did no injustice to Mr. W. by thus printing them; and that, should we have occasion to repeat them, we shall still possess the right of using Italics, or capitals, just as we please.

It is not for the purpose of retorting, or retaliating, but to promote the sober ends of truth and justice, that we advise Mr. Channing to look at the manner in which his own quotations are made. In extracting from Mr. Wells's letter the very sentence, which furnished him with a pretext for the violent attack upon us, he is chargeable with a gross blunder. Referring to this sentence, as we had abridged it, he says to Mr. Thacher; "Let me ask you to look back and compare it carefully with the second sentence, which I have extracted from that letter." Now one would think, that if he wished Mr. T. to "compare it *carefully*," he would have felt the necessity of quoting it carefully. Far otherwise. The sentence, as he quotes it, reads thus: "Nor do they think it at all necessary to conceal their sentiments, but express them *without reserve* when they judge it proper." The real sentence, as we accurately quoted it at large in Mr. W.'s letter, has the latter clause thus: "but express them *without the least hesitation* when they judge it proper." This is a very material variation. It so far alters Mr. W.'s testimony, as to make him declare that which is certainly unfounded, where he had said nothing but the truth: for though the clergy of the liberal party may 'express their sentiments,' or at least some of them, "*without the least hesitation*," in conversation with their friends, and "**WHEN THEY JUDGE IT PROPER;**" yet they never do, and never can, on any occasion whatever, as Mr. Channing's writings sufficiently prove, 'express their sentiments generally *without reserve*.' It might have been well, if Mr. C. had thought more about making a fair and accurate quotation himself, and less about 'dipping his pen in gall' to transform a perfectly innocent transaction into a heinous crime.

But this is not the worst misquotation, which Mr. C. is bound to answer for. He professes to give, p. 10, what he calls "the second charge of the Review." In doing this, he prints a sentence of five lines with marks of quotation, so that every reader would suppose it to have been taken *verbatim*; and that it stood, in our Review,

as a continued sentence. The fact is, that all the words of the sentence are not to be found, even in separate clauses, any where in the review; but nearly all of them are to be found in the following manner. For the first line of the sentence you must search p. 250 of the Panoplist; for the second, p. 251, near the bottom; for the third, p. 260; and the two last may be discovered in p. 262. A fair and honorable way, indeed, of making quotations! This is not all. If our meaning had been correctly given, (supposing it possible that it could be correctly given, in a sentence thus patched up,) we should not complain. But Mr. C. represents us as directing this obnoxious sentence against "the ministers of Boston and the vicinity, and the most considerable members of the liberal party," whereas not a single clause of it is thus applied. One clause is applied to the leading Unitarians in this country; another to clergymen whom Mr. Belsham reprehended so severely for their cowardice; another to those, who were implicated in Mr. Wells's representation; and the remaining clause was not applied by us at all, but was left as a mere general observation, of which the truth was so evident that it could not be denied.

We shall leave this subject after noticing a circumstance, which Mr. Channing cannot pretend to justify. It is this. Though he brought against us a charge of having misquoted a sentence from Mr. Wells's letter, he entirely omitted to inform his readers, that we had published the *whole of that letter*, in a preceding part of our review, where the sentence in question was accurately given. This is a fact which his readers ought to have known; but which, as he must be aware, many of them never would know, unless he informed them of it. If we had erred, in the case alleged, our readers had ample means of detecting the error; indeed an attentive reader could not help detecting it; and this circumstance would afford a strong presumption, that we had not erred intentionally. But Mr. C. inflames the minds of his readers with the charge, that we had wilfully and maliciously misquoted a certain passage; while he forgets to tell them, that we had previously quoted the same passage accurately; (which is more than he was able to do;) and that we had quoted it not by itself merely,—but with its whole context. Thus prone is Mr. C. to bring forward inflammatory and exaggerated charges, without the slightest support for them; and thus forgetful of the plainest demands of justice.

(*To be continued.*)

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

JOURNAL OF ABDOOL MESSEE.

We published, in our number for February, some account of Abdool Messee, a converted Mahometan. We now insert a very interesting Journal of his labors and services, kept by the Rev. Daniel Corrie, and communicated to the Church Missionary Society, in England. This journal we intend to continue in our future numbers.

Journal of a Voyage up the Ganges, from Calcutta to Agra, made by ABDOOL MESSEE, one of the Readers supported in India by the Church Missionary Society: written by one of the Chaplains of the Honorable East-India Company.

Nov. 20, 1812.—We left the neighborhood of Calcutta, having two friends in company. There was a large party of boatmen and servants.

Nov. 22.—Being Sunday we rested at a plain, away from any village. Abdool invited the boats' crews and others to his boat, to hear the word of God; but none of them would attend.

Nov. 29.—We rested also in a lonely place. In the afternoon, Abdool collected the boatmen and others on the bank, to the number of about forty, and preached to them. He began and ended with a hymn, after the manner of the Asiatic Religious, in which he was joined by the Christian Children and Servants. His discourse was from the latter end of the 1st chapter of St. Matthew. He spoke of our sinful state by nature, adducing many proofs observable in their own life and conversation, which render a Savior necessary; enlarged on the birth of Christ without sin, that he might be a suitable Surety for sinners; the meaning of his name Jesus, Immanuel; bringing forward proofs of his divine power, and pointing out the salvation which he bestows. The latter part was very-satisfactory indeed, as an evidence of his acquaintance with the change which passes in the Christian's mind. His discourse was intermixed with exhortations to embrace the religion of the only Savior. Some, it seems, set light by what they heard: others approved, and said his book contained more weighty truths than their Shasters.

Dec. 5. Saturday.—We arrived in the neighborhood of a Christian Friend, and our party went from the boats to pass the Sunday at his house, and found literally in the wilderness God present in our little assembly.

Abdool could not get the boatmen to attend him; and therefore, taking the Christian Children with him, he went to a village at a little distance, and began to sing his hymn. The whole village, men, women, and children, soon gathered round him. He explained to them the Ten Commandments, and enforced their obligation. They heard with much attention. One man in particular, was much impressed, and endeavored to awaken the minds of the people, dwelling especially on the Ninth Commandment as most excellent.

Dec. 11.—At Rajeinal, Abdool met in the street a Musselman, whom he had known before at Rampore, and who accompanied him to his boat. They had much conversation on the subject of religion, which ended with the Musselman's saying, that he could never embrace the religion of the English, they were so unclean in all things, eating swine's flesh, and every unclean thing, and using no ablutions. Abdool replied, by turning to the Christian Children, and asking them, if they knew any passage of Scripture in answer. One of them, without hesitation, quoted Matthew xv, 17—20.

On Sunday, Dec. 13, at 3 p. m. Abdool went out to the skirts of a village, at which we rested, where a number of people were collected; and, after singing two or three verses of a hymn, in which he was joined as usual, began by telling the people he was about to shew them how sinners might obtain salvation. He said, "If a Hindoo, by any accident, should kill a cow, he would renounce the world, and wander from place to place: if any one should ask him who he was, he would reply, 'A sinner!' and if they should inquire what he had been guilty of, to oblige him thus to wander about, he would say, he had killed a cow. Now, though killing a cow is not so great a sin as that a man should distress himself about it in this manner; yet you may learn a lesson from this misguided Hindoo, and think with yourselves what pains you should be at to be delivered from your sins." He then briefly adduced some proofs of man's fallen condition, and dwelt at large on Adam's original state, with many useful exhortations; and concluded with some account of Jesus Christ and his laws; desiring them, that as they, every one, used their own judgment when they went into the bazar, and made their purchase where they got the best and cheapest rice, so they would each use his own judgment now, and choose that religion which afforded the best remedy for sin. He closed with prayer, that God would enable them to choose aright.

Bhaugulpore, Friday, Dec. 18.—Arrived at mid-day, and spent the afternoon here. Abdool took a few copies of St. Matthew's Gospel in Hindoostanee; and, going into the town, came to a Durjah, where were a number, as it afterward appeared, of learned men: some aged, who attend the tomb of

the saint; and some young, their disciples. On Abdool's approach, they, observing his respectable appearance, rose with great deference to salute him, and invited him in to see the saint: he answered, "He is dead, and cannot be seen;" they replied, "Well, but come in, and pay your devotions;" he again answered, "The saint cannot hear me, nor answer my prayers." They expressed their surprise, and inquired who and what he was. He told them he had been a Mahometan, but was now a Christian. They asked why he had come among them, this being the case: he replied, not to visit the dead, but the living; and that, as he was passing, he wished to leave them some valuable token, for which purpose he had brought some books, than which nothing could be more valuable, if they were disposed to read them. Some of them asked, what books these were: he answered, "A book whose name you have often heard, but which you have never seen—the first part of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, written by Matthew, his disciple, and an apostle." One of them said, "What language is it?" He answered, "Oordoo." An aged man came forward, and with great eagerness said, "Pray, Sir, give me one: I have greatly desired to see the Gospel, and once met with a copy, but it was in Nagree, and I could not read it." One of the party asked Abdool what induced him to become a Christian: he said, they acknowledged the Pentateuch, Psalms, and Gospels to be Divine Books, as well as the Koran; that he found the first three to agree, but the fourth was very different: he concluded, that, of four men, if three agreed and the fourth contradicted them, he must utter a falsehood: and if they would read the book which he offered them, they would find it so. Two of them received the books; and, after having looked into them, returned them, saying, they had had books given them before, which spoke ill of their Prophet, and it was not lawful for them to read such. Abdool said the Gospel spoke ill of no one; on the contrary, commanded us to pray for our enemies. The elderly man, who had thankfully received the book, and kept silence hitherto, now addressed his companions, observing what pains the Christians took, and how they sought after truth: at the same time remarking, that they had not only been at the pains of translating their Scriptures into the Eastern Languages, and having them printed; but sought out opportunities for distributing them. Some of the young men asked Abdool, what he got for his trouble: he said he came of his own accord, for their advantage; and contrasted their disposition to taunt, with the favorable one manifested by the elderly person, noticing that the contrast itself verified the Gospel account of the success of the Word: then, opening the book, he read and explained to them the Parable of the Sower. After a good deal of mixed conversation, he took leave of them, and they parted with mutual civilities.

Two of the young men from the Durjah followed Abdool to the boat; and, after a good deal of friendly discussion, they went away expressing satisfaction. In the evening we walked to the Roman Catholic Church. The Christians, to the number of ten families, reside near it. The priest was absent. Notice was given, and about twelve men and women, with many children, were assembled. To these Abdool preached on the benefit of sanctified affliction, a very suitable address to their low estate. The congregation consists in general, of thirty adults, and many children. The poor natives are miserably wretched and ignorant; and the Portuguese, though not generally poor, are careless of their indigent brethren. I gave away four Portuguese New Testaments, and one Hindooostanee St. Matthew's Gospel. The people are so afraid of their priest, that they durst not let me take any of their children.

Sunday, Dec. 20.—We rested at Jehaughyree. At 3 o'clock, Abdool went on shore with his native Christian Friends. The boats' crews had gone into the market, and no congregation was assembled: in about half an hour after, word was brought, that many were assembled, and Abdool had begun. On going out, I found a number of people collected at the end of the village. Abdool was speaking to them of our original descent from one common stock; and, as a proof of it, mentioned similar customs, which prevailed among different people; but that, through the deceit of Satan, they differed in the ap-

plication of the same. He instanced, especially, sacrifices, which both Hindoos and Musselmen considered pleasing to God: he then adverted to the Musselmen's celebration of the Buckree-Eed, which took place on the 10th of this month, in commemoration of Abraham offering up his son, who they say was Ishmael. He next read the history of Abraham offering up his son Isaac, from the 22d chapter of Genesis, which very evidently arrested their attention. He again adverted to their customs, saying, that both Hindoos and Musselmen required their sacrifices to be without blemish, and then pointed out these sacrifices as typical of the Lord Jesus Christ, with suitable exhortations as usual; and ended by telling them, the Gospel in Hindooostanee and Persian was in his possession, and they might have a copy of it gratis, by coming to his boat. He began and concluded with a hymn, in which he was joined by the Christian children and servants. In the evening, two learned Bramins came at different times to his boat, and said they had heard his preaching; and, understanding that he had books to give away, wished to know what they were: this led to much conversation on religion, and ended with their thankfully receiving the Gospel of St. Matthew in Hindooostanee, and the three Gospels in Persian. After this a Mahometan came, who said he was the intimate and relation of a neighboring Rajah; and demanded, in a fierce tone, what this new way might be. Abdool entered into conversation with him, and read the fifth chapter of St. Matthew, with which he was much pleased, and begged a copy of the Gospel, at the same time proposing to visit him next morning; but it was explained to him that we were to set off by day-break.

Monghyr, Dec. 22.—At this place, there are about twenty native Christians, most of them of Portuguese origin, who have served in the Company's army, and have retired hitherto on their pensions. Notice being given in the evening, ten men of these and one woman assembled by candle-light. On Abdool's going in where they were, the master of the house took him by the hand, and shewed him an image of the Virgin, with a light before her, to which he intimated he should pay his respects. Abdool immediately said, that he was come on purpose to talk to him about these things, and to explain what the Gospel doctrine was. He expressed his surprise, saying, that he thought Abdool had but lately turned from Mahometanism, and had come to worship with them. This brought on a long conversation, which led one of them to ask him whether he was a priest. Abdool replied, that he durst not pretend to any such honor: but, as a worthless sparrow placed beside a nightingale learns its note, yet still is but a sparrow; so he, an unworthy creature, had, by being in the society of certain acquainted with these matters, acquired some knowledge of them. The people expressed much regret that these things had never been plainly represented to them before; and, on Abdool's taking leave of them, intreated him to visit them again, and kissed his hand at parting, the usual mark of respect shewn to their own priest.

For Christmas Day, I translated the Sermon on the Nativity in the Village Sermons, which Abdool expresses more pleasure in, than any instruction he ever met with.

Tuesday, Dec. 29.—We arrived at Patna. Some of the Christians visited us that evening at our boats. Next day, Abdool had a conversation with a Roman Catholic Priest, an Italian, on the differences between their two churches. The priest asserted, that the use of images in worship, the doctrine of the intercession of saints, and prayers to the Virgin Mary, were founded on the traditions of the Church, of which they (the Roman Catholics) were the true members. Abdool asked the proof of this. The priest adduced the usual passage, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church.* Abdool replied by pointing out the true meaning. The priest told him, they did not allow the laity to put their own interpretation on the Scriptures, and that his interpretation was the true one and sufficient. Abdool replied, that his clergy said their own interpretation was not sufficient, and always confirmed one part of Scripture by another: "and how can we know otherwise," said he, "that your interpretations are true?" The priest answered, by referring to that passage, *Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end*.

of the world. Abdool said, "I have heard that some of your clergy in this country have been excommunicated, and have indeed done things not fit to be mentioned: are we then to believe that God is with *them*, and to *hear them?*" The priest answered, that they were the true church; and that we, the English, had been expelled from them, and were under a curse. Abdool said, that the English had read the Scriptures, and went out of themselves from the Church of Rome, and, so far from being expelled, though the Church of Rome had tried a thousand ways to bring them back, many had yielded up their lives rather than return. To this the priest: "The English are only a new branch: we are the root. But I perceive that your priests have told you their own falsehoods respecting us." Abdool: "I have heard, that about the time of Mahomet, the Pope began to establish a new order of things, different from the Gospel; which, when the English Clergy by reading the Scriptures discovered, they returned to the primitive order. Our ministers have, indeed, told me the difference between the two churches, which to-day, from your own mouth, I find to be true; but, before God I declare, I never heard them speak ill of you, but rather express a desire that you should turn from your errors and be saved." The priest expressed some impatience, and asked what good would arise from dispersing the Scriptures, and why he should say so much about translating and reading them." Abdool said, "Had the Scriptures not been translated, how should I ever have known the truth? And the necessity of reading the Scriptures is plain, for your people, if they go among the Hindoos and Musselmen, have nothing to say in favor of their religion, and are easily swayed by the superstitions around them." Then, mentioning an instance of an American Christian having become a Mahometan at Betia, where there is a Roman Catholic Priest, he added, "Had you suffered that man to read the Scriptures, he never could have forsaken light for darkness;" and further exhorted him to put away images, and teach the people the true way. The priest said, he taught according to the traditions of the Church, and did not allow the laity to give any opinion. Abdool: "But how can the use of images be distinguished from the Hindoo Idolatry?" Priest: "We do not worship images." Abdool: "So say the Hindoos." Priest: "We have true images; they, false ones." Abdool: "But they say, theirs are true images: how shall we know the true opinion upon this doctrine?" Priest: "By tradition." Abdool: "I beseech you, Sir, not to expose Christianity by the mention of tradition. The Mahometans say, that Mahomet cut the moon into two by a motion of his hand; and when you ask them how they prove this, they answer by tradition. The Scriptures are the only standard of truth." The conversation here ended with the priest's pronouncing a curse upon Abdool; on which he said, "I am sorry for you, Sir, rather than for myself. Your ill-will with respect to me, is on account of the testimony of Jesus; for which I rejoice: but on your part it denotes a carnal mind?" Then turning to eight or ten Christian People, he said to them, "Think not that your minister has satisfied my mind; on the contrary, he and you are in error; and I fairly warn you, search for truth, as you must account to God." He afterward visited eight or ten of their houses, exhorting them to seek truth, and judge for themselves; and advised them to apply to the Baptist Missionaries, who would teach them the right way. One of them came after us to Danapore, and staid two nights and one day, occupying most of the time in discoursing about religion.

At Danapore, we were gratified with the sight of a large school of native children, kept by the Baptist Missionaries. They have another school in a neighboring village. One of the Missionaries told me, that Mr. Martyn's name is held in great esteem by the natives here; and that the schools which he had instituted when here, had rendered the way easier, for the people now send their children to school without scruple. I remember it was not so when Mr. Martyn began his schools.

On leaving Danapore, our boat went on a-head, when Abdool's boatmen took the liberty of going into the market without leave. Abdool, desirous to keep up with us, that he might read the Scriptures as usual, said to the Christian Children, "Come, let us take hold of the line, and draw the boat ourselves; which when they hear of, they will be ashamed and come." In

this way they went about a mile on the bank of the river, when they came where a Mahometan Merchant was purchasing wood. On seeing Abdool, he asked privately of one of the children who he was, and was answered, "A Christian." When the boat came up, the merchant said, "Pray, Sir, wait for your boatmen, and do not take that trouble." Abdool: "They have behaved very ill, and this is the only punishment I can give them, by trying to shame them." Merchant. "But for a man of your appearance to engage in such servile work, is degrading. Do you not feel ashamed yourself, before all these people?" Abdool: "Before, when I was of your religion, I should indeed have felt shame; but I have embraced a religion whose Author was meek and lowly; and now I rather take pleasure in such employment, as by this the pride of my heart is brought down." Merchant: "What religion have you embraced?" Abdool: "The religion of Jesus." Merchant: "Yes, I was told true of you;" and here he began to give him some very coarse language. As they stood there some time, Abdool had an opportunity of showing this man some civility; which made him call him hypocrite; and, turning to several who were collected, he said, "See how well this man has learned to disguise his feelings; I gave him abuse, and he returns civility." Abdool: "This is not hypocrisy, but what I am taught by my new religion. Before, you are aware, had you used such language to me, I should perhaps have fought with you, but now I am taught to pray for my enemies:" then, taking out St. Matthew's Gospel, he began to read in the fifth chapter. The merchant was ashamed; and, after some further conversation, begged he might have a copy of the Gospel, as did also another person, who had been present toward the conclusion.

(*To be continued.*)

IMPORTANT STATE PAPERS.

A few days before the following documents were received in this country, an intelligent Christian was observing, that the governments of professedly Christian nations are exceedingly deficient in public respect for the Christian religion. The observation is undoubtedly just. You may search whole volumes of state papers, on an immense variety of great national subjects, without finding a single acknowledgment, on the part of rulers, that they are accountable to God, or a single exhortation to subjects, that they should become the willing subjects of the King of kings and Lord of lords. Much less will you find a full and solemn declaration, that rulers are bound to discharge all their duties according to the strict principles of the Gospel; and that the Lord Jesus Christ is to be honored and obeyed as the Sovereign Ruler of all nations. It was with great pleasure, mixed with astonishment, that we first perused the religious treaty, entered into by the Emperors of Russia, and Germany, and the King of Prussia. The more we have reflected on this extraordinary event, the more has its importance been magnified in our view.

ED. PAR.

[*Translated for the Boston Daily Advertiser.*]

In the name of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity.
THEIR Majesties, the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Russia, in consequence of the great events which have distinguished Europe, in the course of the three last years, and especially of the blessings which it has pleased Divine Providence to shed upon those states whose governments have placed their confidence and their hope in it alone, having acquired the thorough conviction, that it is necessary for ensuring their continuance, that the several powers, in their mutual relations adopt the sublime truths which are pointed out to us by the eternal religion of the Savior God:—

Declare solemnly that the present act has no other object than to show in the face of the universe their unwavering determination to adopt for the only rule of their conduct, both in the administration of their respective states, and in their political relations with every other government, the precepts of this holy religion, the precepts of justice of charity and of peace, which, far from being solely applicable to private life, ought, on the contrary, directly to in-

fluence the resolutions of princes, and to guide all their undertakings, as being the only means of giving stability to human institutions, and of remedying their imperfections.

Their majesties have therefore agreed to the following articles.

Art. I. In conformity with the words of the Holy Scriptures, which command all men to regard one another as brethren, the three contracting monarchs will remain united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity, and considering each other as compatriots, they will lend one another on every occasion, and in every place, assistance, aid, and support; and regarding their subjects and armies, as the fathers of their families, they will govern them in the spirit of fraternity with which they are animated, for the protection of religion, peace and justice.

Art. II. Therefore the only governing principle between the above mentioned governments and their subjects, shall be that of rendering reciprocal services; of testifying by an unalterable beneficence the mutual affection with which they ought to be animated; of considering all as only the members of one Christian nation, the three allied princes looking upon themselves as delegated by Providence to govern three branches of the same family; to wit: Austria, Prussia, and Russia; confessing likewise that the Christian nation of which they and their people form a part, have really no other sovereign than him to whom alone power belongs of right because in him alone are found all the treasures of love, of science and of wisdom; that is to say, God our divine Savior Jesus Christ, the Word of the Most High, the Word of life. Their majesties therefore recommend, with the most tender solicitude to their people as the only means of enjoying that peace which springs from a good conscience, and which alone is durable, to fortify themselves every day more and more in the principles and exercise of the duties which the divine Savior has pointed out to us.

Art. III. All powers who wish solemnly to profess the sacred principles which have dictated this act, and who shall acknowledge how important it is to the happiness of nations, too long disturbed, that these truths shall henceforth exercise upon human destines all the influence which belongs to them, shall be received with as much readiness as affection, into this holy alliance.

Made tripartite, and signed at Paris, in the year of our Lord, 1815, on the 14th (26) of September.

FRANCIS,

FREDERIC WILLIAM,

ALEXANDER. .

ALEXANDER.

St. Petersburg, the day of the birth of our Savior, the 25th of December 1815.

The following was the preamble to the publication of the HOLY LEAGUE, at St. Petersburg:—

"By the Grace of God, We, Alexander the First, Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias, &c. hereby make known—

"As we have seen from experience, and from the unhappy consequences that have resulted for the whole world, that the course of the political relations in Europe, between the Powers, has not been founded on those true principles upon which the wisdom of God in his revelations has founded the peace and prosperity of all nations.

"We have consequently, in conjunction with their Majesties the Emperor of Austria, Francis the First, and the King of Prussia, Frederic William, proceeded to form an alliance between us, (to which the other Christian Powers are invited to accede,) in which we reciprocally engage, both between ourselves and in respect to our subjects, to adopt, as the sole means to attain this end, the principle drawn from the words and doctrine of our Savior Jesus Christ, who preaches not to live in enmity and hatred, but in peace and love. We hope and implore the blessing of the Most High; may this sacred union be confirmed between all the powers for their general good, and

(detected by the union of all the rest) may no one dare to fall off from it. We accordingly subjoin a copy of this union, ordering it to be made generally known, and read in all the churches.

St. Petersburgh on the day of the birth of our Savior, 25th Dec. 1815.

"The original is signed by his Imperial Majesty's own hand.

"ALEXANDER."

REMARKS.

WE are unwilling to publish the foregoing papers without a few brief observations.

1. The proclamation of the Emperor of Russia contains several most important declarations.

It confesses the general guilt of the European governments, in not having conducted their affairs, either professedly or really, upon the principles of the Gospel.

It acknowledges that the principles of the Gospel are the only true principles of government; and that the wisdom of God has founded the prosperity, as well as the peace, of all nations on these principles alone.

It pledges the Emperor to every one of his subjects to follow the directions of our Savior, and to aim, in his intercourse with foreign nations, to live in peace and love with them.

It expresses an earnest desire, that all nations may come into the same pacific union, which is contained in the treaty about to be published.

It breathes a devout supplication to God for his blessing upon this most beneficent and sublime enterprise.

It provides for the thorough promulgation of the treaty, in every part of the Russian territories, so that none of the nobility, clergy, military, and peasantry may be ignorant of the contemplated change in the policy of nations.

2. The treaty itself begins, as indeed Russian state papers often do, with a solemn invocation of the adorable Trinity. Such an invocation seems peculiarly proper, at the commencement of a paper, which was drawn up for the express purpose of declaring allegiance to the ever blessed God.

3. The treaty adopts the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the only rule of political conduct, both in the foreign and domestic relations of governments.

4. The only object of this treaty is to bind the contracting parties to *do good* to each other, and to all men, and to do evil to none.

5. It is here acknowledged, and in terms of great solemnity, that the second person in the Trinity, the adorable Savior of men, is the rightful Sovereign and Proprietor of the world which he has redeemed; and that all rulers should consider themselves as deriving whatever rightful power they possess from Him alone. In this point of view, it has been well observed, that this treaty complies, in a wonderful manner, with the directions in the second Psalm. Indeed, this Psalm appears strikingly descriptive of the scenes, which have taken place in Europe within a few years past.

6. The treaty exhorts all the subjects of the three contracting monarchs to place their hopes in the Christian religion.

7. It is remarkable that such a treaty should have been entered into by the Emperor of Russia, in whose dominions the greater part of the Greek church is situated, the King of Prussia, the most considerable Protestant ruler on the continent of Europe, and the Emperor of Germany, who is now the most powerful Roman Catholic sovereign.

8. Taking into view the last remark, the treaty teaches a most important lesson of toleration; viz. that rulers and subjects of different religious communions, though some of them must be in great errors, owe each other nothing but good-will, and acts of kindness and charity.

9. The three monarchs execute this treaty in a manner different from that in which their most solemn engagements are usually executed. It is

almost universally the case, that treaties are executed by ministers, and not by the parties themselves. But here all ministerial aid is dispensed with, and the parties, acting as though this was in a peculiar sense a transaction between God and their own souls, sign the instrument with their own hands. What an interesting spectacle! Three great monarchs, ruling over more than *seventy millions* of people, assemble in a secret chamber, and, after imploring the divine presence and blessing, expressly and solemnly devote themselves and their people to Christ, to be ruled by his precepts and by authority derived from him only. They afterwards publish to the world the instrument which they had drawn up, thus pledging themselves in the sight of the universe to the faithful discharge of its obligations.

10. This treaty was signed at Paris, a few years ago the seat of a horrible conspiracy against Christ and his cause. In the very place where Voltaire and his associates used *Crush the wretch*, as their watchword, these monarchs assembled, many hundred miles from their respective residences, to honor Christ as the source of all power, the only teacher of duty, the only bestower of happiness.

11. The King of Prussia has witnessed and tasted the bitter fruits of infidelity, in consequence of the leading part which his predecessor, Frederic falsely called the Great, took in fostering and promoting the embryo conspiracy above referred to. Happy would it be, if all men were as ready to see and acknowledge the finger of Providence.

12. It is very remarkable, that so important a paper as this, drawn up by persons of different educations and prejudices, should be so happily and unexceptionably expressed. We have conversed with many persons concerning it, but have never heard the slightest fault found with it, nor the slightest emendation proposed. The sentences, however, are probably not so lucid, as they were in the original French.

We conclude by saying, that we doubt not all Christians will rejoice to offer prayers, that these monarchs and their subjects may know by experience the value of that benediction, which closes the second Psalm: "*Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him.*"

ED. PAN.

SECOND QUARTERLY CIRCULAR OF THE PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To all Foreign Mission Societies, other Benevolent Associations, &c.

BELOVED FRIENDS AND HELPERS,

In the Panoplist for January of the present year, we published a paper, entitled "*Thoughts on various methods of advancing the cause of Christ by Missionaries at Bombay.*" In that interesting paper our Missionaries, by whom it was drawn up, present a view of the deplorable condition of the Heathen, and of what is necessary to be done for them, which cannot fail to affect the heart and stir the spirit of every feeling reader. They shew in a strong light, that the missionary work is great, painful and arduous, and requires primitive self-devotion, invincible perseverance, and bounteous liberality; but they make it appear, at the same time, that if the work be conducted with the true spirit, in the right manner, and with adequate means, accompanied with the promised influence and blessing of Heaven, the Gospel, with all its temporal and eternal benefits, may be spread through the heathen world. This is a momentous point. Let it once be settled in the minds, and brought home to the feelings, of the many thousands in Christian lands, who prize the Gospel as Heaven's best gift to mankind, and wish well to the highest interests of the great human family, that the pagan nations may be evangelized, and the glorious consummation is made sure. Objections to this heavenly work will be thrown aside; excuses for declining to aid it, and pleas

for delay will be discarded; the sordid calculations of cankered avarice, and the invidious suggestions of unhallowed jealousy, will be abhorred. Every valley will be filled, and every mountain and hill be made low; the crooked will be made straight, and the rough places plain; and Christendom, moved by an impulse not to be restrained, will pour forth laborers and benefactions into all parts of the pagan world.

Let the point then be settled in every mind, and brought home to every heart: The pagan world *can be evangelized*; six hundred millions of our fellow beings, sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, can be enlightened, and turned from their vanities unto the living God; "the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth" can be destroyed "from the earth and from under these heavens." All this can be done,—must be done,—will be done: the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken to this effect. This truth should be proclaimed in every place; this sentiment should be made to glow in every breast, where the word of Jehovah is known.

But all this is not to be done without means, without labor, without expense. Many hundreds of missionaries must be furnished for the work and supported in it; thousands of schools must be established, and supplied with teachers and books; the Scripture must be translated into many languages, printed in various and numerous editions, and dispersed through extensive regions. The expense of all this must be great. Some indeed may regard it as too great to be supported. An individual may think, that his mite, his dollar, his five, ten, or even his hundred dollars, would be no more to the requisite total sum, than a drop of water to the ocean. Let this individual then think again, that the ocean itself is made up of drops. The vastness of the expense, instead of being a reason why any one should excuse himself from contributing, is the most powerful reason why every person should contribute, and persevere in contributing, as the bounteous Giver of every good gift shall enable him. Great as the expense must be, it can well be supported. The wealth of Christendom is sufficient, and more than sufficient. Let the people of this land unite with those of other Christian lands, and all set their hearts upon this work, religiously resolving to contribute to it as much as they can, consistently with other claims upon what, as the Lord's stewards, they possess; and his sacred treasury for spreading and establishing his kingdom of unbounded blessings in all the earth, will be abundantly and continually supplied.

After these general observations, we wish to draw your attention, at this time, more particularly to one of the "various methods of advancing the cause of Christ," on which our Missionaries, in the paper above referred to, have offered their "thoughts:" viz. that of **EDUCATING HEATHEN CHILDREN AND YOUTH.**

When considering the general subject of education, our missionaries first contemplate a school to be attached to the mission, for the instruction of various classes of children in *English*. Such a school they have already commenced at Bombay, for which they think many children, some entirely and others partly of European extraction, may be obtained.

[For the description of the contemplated schools the reader is referred to the Panoplist for January last, pp. 37—39.]

Some, whom we now address, have doubtless read the paper from which these extracts are made; others however may not have seen it; and we have chosen to let the Missionaries speak in their own manner upon this subject, as we are earnestly desirous that a deep, and lasting, and efficacious impression should be made on every mind. On the same subject, the venerable Dr. JOHN, the late Lutheran Missionary at Tranquebar, who had labored more than forty years in the service, has made some most valuable and interesting communications. In his Report on the Civilization of India, to which our Missionaries in the above extracts refer, after mentioning accounts which he had read of the free schools established in England, on the plans of the Rev Dr. BELL and Mr. JOSEPH LANCASTER; of the high patronage which they had received; and the great success which had attended them, Dr. JOHN says, "How great have been the emotions of my heart in viewing

these reports! and how ardent have been my wishes, that our poor native youth in India might be kindly remembered by such advocates, and that free schools might be established here by the concurrence of these leading benefactors. The cries and earnest intreaties of poor neglected children and their parents put forward the most powerful pleas for succors and provisions of this nature. As a daily witness of this pressing want, I have been frequently requested by parents and children, with tears in their eyes, to receive them into my private institution, which I have done mingling my tears with theirs."

So deeply was the mind of this excellent man impressed with the importance of free schools for the instruction of heathen children, that about ten years ago, he "resolved to make a voyage of two or three years to England, Denmark, and Germany, chiefly for the purpose of tendering in person his proposals for this object." "But sickness," says he, "prevented the accomplishment of my purpose. I resumed therefore with patience my former functions, and waited for another more favorable period for executing my designs." After various disappointments respecting the patronage and means, which he thought it important to obtain, he at length resolved to do what he could with the means in his own power. "I made silently," says he, "a small beginning with the children, who implored and cried for reception, and could not be received into the orphan school in town. I opened a school in the nearest village, in which about ten Protestant children of the lower class were instructed, and enlarged it for the benefit of Roman Catholics and heathens; the number of which soon increased to eighty, who were taught reading, writing, and cyphering, by an able school-master and two ushers. Seeing the rapid increase of requests from poor parents of all casts, I established another school at Bethlehem, of Sootra children, which was soon frequented by about fifty. There an honest and moral heathen offered to keep a school according to my regulations. I accepted his offer; and the school was soon frequented by sixty children; and a Christian usher was added to teach Christian children the principles of the Christian religion." Thus he proceeded until in about two years he had twenty schools in different parts of the country, in a flourishing state. "Even the heathen children," says he, "learn select Psalms and Lessons of Sirach, and parts of the New-Testament, with such pleasure, that their parents and relations often express their great approbation, and acknowledge that their children grow in these schools wiser than they themselves; and are surprised at their changed conduct, so different from their former, especially regarding the duties of children to their parents, superiors, and magistrates, which they hear are from God and not human ordinances only. In short, a good number have already gone out of the schools, who have learned so much reading in Tamul and English, and so much useful knowledge, as they no where could have obtained, if they had not been instructed in these Free Schools; and have lessened among the heathen the prejudices against the Holy Scriptures and the Christian religion."

Not only have these schools been thus approved and applauded by heathen parents and relations; but by the heathen Rajah [King] of Tanjore, they have been patronized and aided. "I have already mentioned," says Dr. JOHN, "that he [the Rajah] approved of my intended voyage to Europe; and I must now add, to his honor, that by the present then made to me, he became, after my disappointment, the sole original benefactor, who has supported me, and enabled me to put my school plan in execution. Since Feb. 1810, his Highness has made me another present of two hundred pagodas. By this donation, and by what remained of the former, to which I added a share from my own little estate, I was enabled to put a thousand pagodas [less than two thousand dollars] into the mission-cash. This is the only fund from which I have taken for nearly two years past to defray the monthly salary for school-masters, ushers, seminarists, &c. and for encouraging the poorest children, after the monthly examinations, by cash, clothes, fruit, books, paper, pens, &c."

Such, then, is the deplorable condition of heathen children; such the success of a short experiment, made by the exertions of one man for their education; and such the comparatively small expense, at which schools for their benefit may be supported. "The whole expense," say our Missionaries, "of a school which should contain fifty children, might probably on an average be brought within the small compass of twelve dollars a month;" which is about three dollars a year for each child. According to this estimate, (and it should seem that the average expense of Dr. John's schools fell even short of this,) the money expended by the people of the United States, for ardent spirits, would support schools sufficient in number for the instruction of more than ten millions of poor heathen children, who are in danger of perishing for lack of knowledge.

In our Report to the Board, at the annual meeting in September last, we gave a brief statement of the very successful experiment, in the way of schooling, of the Rev. GIDEON BLACKBURN, among a heathen tribe in our own country; and thence made a representation of the practicability of bringing that whole tribe, consisting of about twelve thousand souls, to be, within no long period of time, "English in their language, Christian in their religion, and civilized in their general habits and manners;" and of extending the same blessings to other Indian tribes.

The Committee are ardently wishing to commence this work with suitable instruments and with adequate means, and not less ardently do they wish to have it in their power to co-operate, upon an extended scale, in the still greater work of imparting the blessings of Christian education to the many millions of heathen children, in the populous regions of the East.

It is proper here to add, that Providence has cast upon our shores a number of heathen youths, from the different islands of the Pacific Ocean. They came in merchant vessels, as cabin boys, and sailors, and not finding a convenient opportunity to return, they remain in different parts of our country. The case of these youths has for several years interested the feelings of the pious and benevolent to whom it has been known. Something has been done for their education. Three of them have become hopefully pious, one of whom has been regularly admitted a member of the church in Torringford, (Con.) under the pastoral care of the Rev. Mr. MILLS. The three are now receiving an education, in the families of respectable clergymen, at the expense of the Board. Another heathen youth has been placed with them by the liberality of a gentleman in Boston. The proficiency of these youths, their character, and prospects of usefulness, have been regularly made known to a respectable body of neighboring clergymen, who are sanguine in the hope, that these forlorn outcasts as they appeared to be, will hereafter return to their native islands, to aid in diffusing the blessings of the Gospel. Many judicious Christians, who have been consulted on the subject, unite in the opinion, that the Christian public will gladly furnish the means of educating the youths here mentioned, and others in a similar condition, as soon as their wants and their claims are particularly known. An account of the three youths, who have become hopefully pious, has been prepared, and is intended to be published.

We have therefore seen fit to institute *A FUND FOR THE PURPOSE, ESPECIALLY, OF EDUCATING HEATHEN CHILDREN AND YOUTH.* This measure will meet the approbation, we cannot doubt, of all the friends of missions; and, we would hope, of many also who have demurred as to the expediency of sending Missionaries to the heathen. We most respectfully and affectionately request the attention of our friends of the various Auxiliary Societies to this object, and solicit their zealous endeavors for its advancement. We do not, indeed, wish them to divert their accustomed contributions from the general missionary object to the more particular object here recommended. But we would suggest, whether each Auxiliary Society might not institute a separate fund, or give it to be understood, that their treasurer will receive, and keep separate, such contributions and donations, as any persons may be disposed to make for the *Education of Heathen Children and Youth.* We would suggest to our friends of these Societies,

both male and female, the expediency of using all proper influence to promote the formation around them of other Societies for this particular object. This seems to be an object especially suited to engage the feelings of *young persons* of both sexes. Even children may find a generous gratification in contributing a portion of their pocket-money, (which they would otherwise spend for useless trifles,) for the benefit of poor heathen children; and the early habit of so contributing would tend to improve their sensibilities, to expand their hearts, to elevate their views, and to form them to virtue and usefulness.

Dear Friends, we repeat it, the HEATHEN WORLD CAN AND MUST BE EVANGELIZED. This stupendous work, the greatest and most important that can engage the hearts and employ the exertions of men, must be done, with the help of God, by those who are blessed with the Gospel. Too long has it been neglected; and immense guilt has been incurred by the neglect. We must not be weary, we must not grow remiss: The work is but just begun. We must persevere in it with steadfast purpose, with glowing zeal, with increasing exertion; and we must do what we can to gain to it the hearts and the hands of all around us.

With affectionate and respectful salutations, we are your servants in the Gospel of our common salvation.

In behalf of the Prudential Committee,
Boston, March 1, 1816.

S. WORCESTER, Clerk.

P. S. Those persons, who make donations and contributions for the specific object here recommended, need write these words only, *For the School Fund*; and the money thus appropriated will be exclusively applied to the education of heathen children and youth, with a particular view to the diffusion of the Gospel.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

THE following brief notices of revivals are taken from letters, mostly written by clergymen to their friends in this part of the country. The dates refer to the times when the letters were written.

Dec. 10, 1815. At Colebrook, (Con.) a revival commenced some weeks since, and has extended into every part of the town: 93 persons, and 18 under 14 years of age, exhibit hopeful evidence of a divine work on their hearts.

Dec. 21, 1815. At Manlius, (N. Y.) 40 miles west of Utica, 16 have within a few weeks, been added to the church. And what is remarkable, the work commenced among the most profligate class of people, some of whom now exhibit hopeful evidence of a work of grace on their hearts.

Dec. 19. "God is glorifying himself and magnifying the riches of his grace in Norfolk, (Con.) Upwards of 100 have, as they hope, been brought out of darkness into light since August last. In Winchester about 40 have been hopefully converted, and the work is increasing. In Sheffield there is considerable attention. In New Marlboro' the work continues. In Sandisfield they reckon about an hundred converts. Surely God is doing great things for this part of his vineyard."

A letter from Durham, (N. Y.) dated Dec. 20, mentions a revival of religion in the adjoining town of Windham; in which upwards of 80 have apparently embraced the Gospel. Greenville, in the same county, has been favored with the effusion of the Spirit. More than usual attention to religion is, at present, observable in Durham. In Catskill, a work of grace has been going on for some time; but the number of hopeful converts is not stated.

A letter dated Dec. 27, mentions that "a revival of religion has commenced in Campton, (N. H.) where Mr. Day is preaching. Between 20 and 30 are hopefully converted."

In Salisbury, (N. H.) between 70 and 80 persons have united with the church, and 25 more exhibit evidence of a saving change. In Boscowen the revival of religion has become powerful; the particulars not known.

Jan. 31, 1816. "From the latest information from Foxborough and Wrentham, we learn, that in the former town, the number of hopeful converts has increased to about 100; in the latter town, to 80 or 90. The work still continues, and it is hoped, is extending to the neighboring parishes. In Attleborough, a town in the vicinity of Wrentham, the revival of religion, which commenced last fall, still continues. More than 200 persons are considered as the subjects of the work."

Extract from a letter dated Jan. 30.—"In Augusta, under Mr. Ayer's preaching, 120 have hopefully experienced a saving change of heart, within a short time. In Smithfield, Lenox, Pompey, Bloomfield, and Parma, and in several other towns in the western country, there are large revivals. In Rensselaer, Albany county, the work is considerable."

Extract from a letter dated, Princeton Jan. 30. "In the parishes of Easthampton, Sag Harbor, Bridgehampton, and Southampton, (Long Island,) a glorious work of grace has lately commenced. In Easthampton, it is perhaps little more than two months since favorable appearances began to be manifested; and by the last account, there were about 60 cases of hopeful conversion, and the work was still progressive."

Extract from a letter dated Feb. 3.—"West Springfield is experiencing the special influences of the divine favor. Thirty or forty persons are rejoicing in the hope of the glory of God in Dr. Lathrop's society."

From a letter dated Jan. 30th we learn, that the revival of religion has become powerful in Reading, (Vt.) and many of the first characters in town exhibit hopeful evidence of a saving change. Fourteen were added to the church last Sabbath.

A letter from Hartford (Vt.) dated Jan. 23, states, that in Cornish, (N. H.) there has been a late, and very powerful work. Between 70 and 80 persons have hopefully received the truth as it is in Jesus. In Lebanon there is some special attention. Between 20 and 30 have, of late, in the judgment of charity, been made the subjects of renewing grace. In Brookfield, (Vt.) a powerful revival of religion has recently commenced.

Feb. 10. At Williamsburg (Mass.) the work of the Holy Spirit is very conspicuous. More than 60 persons have indulged the hope of an interest in Christ, within a few months.

Extract from a letter dated Feb. 21. "In Kent (Con.) a work of grace commenced five weeks since. Fifteen, or twenty persons have indulged hopes of a saving change. In Winstead 150 persons are the hopeful subjects of the work."

A letter from a gentleman in Philadelphia, dated March 12, observes, that "the revival of religion in Mr. Patterson's society is astonishing. At the last communion 70 were added to the church. Between 100 and 200 more are under serious impressions. A good work has commenced in Mr. Janeway's society."

In Ogeechee Church, (Geo.) more than 400 persons have been admitted to the communion, since 1812; all of whom exhibit evidence of a saving change of heart.

April 1, 1816. "The number of hopeful conversions in Hadley is about 150. In Westhampton, a good work of grace has recently commenced. Ten, or twelve, indulge hopes."

April 3. From a letter, we learn, that, in Bath, (Me.) 55 persons have hopefully embraced the truth of late. Many of the youth and children are deeply affected with religious subjects.

April 11. "The revival in Troy is surprising; we have heard of 60 conversions there."

A letter from the Rev. Daniel Smith, dated Natchez, Feb. 5, 1816, states, that he resided at New-Orleans nearly two months, and had the happiness to witness a little number of Christians uniting in a weekly prayer meeting. On Monday evening, the 1st of January, they held the monthly concert for prayer, when fourteen professors of religion were present. Mr. S. wrote his letter immediately after returning from the first concert of prayer ever held at Natchez. "It is peculiarly delightful," he adds, "in this benighted country, to unite with the thousands of Israel, in supplicating the diffusion of Gospel light, and the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom."

Extract of a letter from the Rev. Charles Prentice, of Canaan, (Conn.) to the Editor of the Panoplist, dated March 16, 1816.

"I am unwilling, Sir, to let this opportunity pass, without saying something as to the flourishing state of religion in this vicinity. The Lord is appearing in his glory to build up Zion. The work is astonishing and glorious in many places. The Spirit descends like rain upon the mown grass, like showers that water the earth. About forty in this Society, and as many in the north parish of this town, have within a few months, been led to rejoice in hope. There is now a revival in Goshen and Cornwall. In Salisbury, (Con.) more than 250 have of late been numbered with the trophies of the Redeemer. In Norfolk, Colebrook, Winchester, New Marlborough, and Sandisfield sinners are flying to Christ as clouds, and as doves to their windows. In the last mentioned town, as I am informed, more than 200 are the hopeful subjects of renewing grace; and more than 100 in each of the other four places. The work is free from enthusiasm, is extended to many children and youth, and to numbers in all the intermediate stages between youth and old age. Yes, many a hoary-headed veteran, who had fought seventy years under the banner of Satan, has left the ranks of the adversary of God, and is now rejoicing at the feet of Jesus. I hope you may be favored with a detailed account of the blessed work, in all the places which I have named.

"How glorious, my dear friend, is the day in which we are permitted to live. What wonders are unfolding. How obvious is it, from the signs of the times, that the long wished for day of the Church's triumph begins to dawn, and that, in all its glory, it will soon be ushered in, with universal hosannas to the Son of David."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

WE have received a statement of the funds of *Union Academy*, and an address to the public in behalf of that institution. We must abridge the statement of funds, and shall insert that, and the address, as soon as we can.

We have not time to answer our correspondents particularly. We hope none of them will accuse us of intentional neglect. It has long been a favorite plan of ours to decide on communications, generally, as soon as they are received; but whether we shall ever be able to reduce it to practice must be decided hereafter. There are many unforeseen interruptions, which tend to prevent the execution of any regular plan. Our correspondents may, without much risk of mistake, suppose that their communications have been received; and, until some notice appears to the contrary, that they are either necessarily deferred, or held under consideration.

We are compelled to omit *Donations to Foreign Missions* and *Obituary notices*.